HANDBUCH DER ORIENTALISTIK

Herausgegeben von B. Spuler
unter Mitarbeit von
H. Franke, J. Gonda, H. Hammitzsch, W. Helck,
J. E. van Lohuizen-de Leeuw und F. Vos

ZWEITE ABTEILUNG

INDIEN

Herausgegeben von J. Gonda

ERSTER BAND

DIE INDISCHEN SPRACHEN

ERSTER ABSCHNITT

OLD INDIAN

BY

J. GONDA

Das „Handbuch der Orientalistik" erscheint in Heften verschiedenen Umfangs in zwangloser Folge. Separatbände sind erhältlich.

HANDBUCH DER ORIENTALISTIK
ZWEITE ABTEILUNG
1. BAND, 1. ABSCHNITT

HANDBUCH DER ORIENTALISTIK

Herausgegeben von B. Spuler
unter Mitarbeit von
H. Franke, J. Gonda, H. Hammitzsch, W. Helck,
J. E. van Lohuizen-de Leeuw und F. Vos

ZWEITE ABTEILUNG

INDIEN

Herausgegeben von J. Gonda

ERSTER BAND

DIE INDISCHEN SPRACHEN

ERSTER ABSCHNITT

OLD INDIAN

OLD INDIAN

BY

J. GONDA

E. J. BRILL
LEIDEN–KÖLN
1971

CONTENTS

PREFACE

In preparing this publication it was the author's intention to concentrate first and foremost upon those problems which, while playing a more or less important part in the history of Old Indo-Aryan linguistics, have continued to engage the attention of scholars up to the present day, and in the second place to discuss some problems of primary importance which, though now generally considered as solved, are, either by their very nature and special significance or for methodical reasons, especially characteristic and illustrative of the progress of the investigations in this particular field of Indological studies. This plan has not however prevented him from including references to questions of minor importance when they seemed to be representative of definite trends in Vedic research which may invite attention because of their didactic or methodical relevance or should not remain unmentioned because the solutions proposed are, in the author's opinion, to be stigmatized as rejectable. On the other hand, the reader is presumed to know the main grammatical facts themselves or to have access to the handbooks in which these are recorded. The inclusion of questions pertaining to Indo-European comparative linguistics or to the later stages of Indo-Aryan has, within the limits of possibility, been avoided, and no attempts are made to supply the reader with introductory information in these fields. It has, moreover, been the author's endeavour to leave unmentioned those publications which may now be regarded as antiquated or, even from the point of view of the critical or didactic historian, devoid of interest. Although the notes might give the impression of being profuse in bibliographical references it may be perceived at a glance that they contain no more than a fraction of the titles collected in Renou's and Dandekar's bibliographies. That on the other hand some well-known handbooks are quoted over and again is partly due to the author's wish to help the reader in seeing the problems in their natural connection, partly to the necessity of criticizing the views expressed by their authors or to indicate what is no longer tenable. Lacunae and misinterpretations were indeed unavoidable even in comparatively recent grammars. In order to facilitate the understanding of the chronological succession of the discussions and solutions of the problems the year of publication has always been added when quoting books, in quoting articles in a considerable number of cases.

ABBREVIATIONS

I. TITLES OF BOOKS

Benfey, Grammatik = Th. B., Vollständige Grammatik der Sanskrit Sprache, Leipzig 1852.

Benveniste, Origines = E. B., Origines de la formation des noms en Indo-européen, I, Paris 1935.

Bloch, L'Indo-aryen = J. B., L'Indo-aryen, Paris 1934.

Brugmann, Grundriss, see Brugmann-Delbrück.

Brugmann, K.V.G. = K. B., Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der idg. Sprachen, Strassburg 1902-1904.

Brugmann, Morph. Untersuchungen = K. B. and H. Osthoff, Morphologische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der idg. Sprachen, 6 vol., Leipzig 1878-1910.

Brugmann-Delbrück, Grundriss = K. B., Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen, vol. I-II, Strassburg 1886-1892; III-V (Vergleichende Syntax) by B. D., Strassburg 1893-1900; 2nd edition K. B. and D. B., Grundriss ..., 2 (6) vol., Strassburg-Berlin-Leipzig ²1906-1930.

Buck, Selected synonyms = C. D. B., A dictionary of selected synonyms in the principal I-E. languages, Chicago 1949.

Burrow, Sanskrit language = T. B., The Sanskrit language, London 1955.

Dandekar, Bibliography = R.N. D., Vedic bibliography, [I] Bombay 1946; II, Poona 1961.

Debrunner, Nachträge = A. D., Nachträge zu Band I (of) J. Wackernagel, Altindische Grammatik, Göttingen 1957.

Delbrück, Altind. Syntax = B. D., Altindische Syntax, Halle a. S. 1888.

Delbrück, Grundriss, see Brugmann-Delbrück.

Delbrück, Verbum = B. D., Das altindische Verbum aus den Hymnen des Ṛigveda seinem Baue nach dargestellt, Halle a. S. 1874.

Delbrück, Vergl. Syntax, see Brugmann-Delbrück.

Fick, Wörterbuch = A. F., Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Grundsprache, Göttingen 1868 (²1871; ³1874-1876; ⁴1890-1909).

Frisk, Wörterbuch = Hj. F., Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, Heidelberg 1954-

Geldner, translation, = K. F. G., Der Ṛigveda übersetzt, Cambridge Mas., 1951.

Geldner, Vedische Studien = R. Pischel and K.F. G., Vedische Studien, 3 vol., Stuttgart 1889-1901.

Gonda, Aspects = J. G., Aspects of early Viṣṇuism, Utrecht 1954 (²New Delhi 1969).

Gonda, Aspectual function = J. G., The aspectual function of the Ṛgvedic present and aorist, The Hague 1962.

Gonda, Brahman = J. G., Notes on Brahman, Utrecht 1950.

Gonda, Four studies = J. G., Four studies in the language of the Veda, The Hague 1959.

Gonda, Moods = J. G., The character of the Indo-European moods, Wiesbaden 1956.

Gonda, Repetition = J. G., Stylistic repetition in the Veda, Amsterdam Acad. 1959.

Gonda, Vision = J. G., The vision of the Vedic poets, The Hague 1963.

Grassmann, Wörterbuch = H. G., Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda, Leipzig 1873 (1936).

Hirt, IdG. Grammatik = H. H., Indogermanische Grammatik, 7 vol., Heidelberg 1927-1937.

Kuiper, Proto-Munda = F.B.J. K., Proto-Munda Words in Sanskrit, Amsterdam 1948.

Leumann, Neuerungen = M. L., Morphologische Neuerungen im altindischen Verbalsystem, Amsterdam 1952.

Liebich, Einführung = B. L., Zur Einführung in die indische einheimische Sprachwissenschaft, 4 vol., Heidelberg 1919-1920.

Macdonell, Vedic grammar = A.A. M., Vedic grammar, Strassburg 1910.

Macdonell, Vedic gr. f. stud. = A. A. M., A Vedic grammar for students, Oxford 1916 (^{3}1953).

Mayrhofer, Grammatik = M. M., Sanskrit-Grammatik, Berlin 1953 (^{2}1965).

Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch = M. M., Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen, Heidelberg 1956-

Meillet, Introduction = A. M., Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes, Paris ^{8}1937.

Monier-Williams, Dictionary = M. M.-W., A Sanskrit-English dictionary, Oxford 1888 (1899; 1956).

Narten, Sigm. Aor. = J. N., Die sigmatischen Aoriste im Veda, Wiesbaden 1964.

Narten, Verb = J. N., Das altindische Verb in der Sprachwissenschaft, Die Sprache, 14 (Wien 1968), p. 113 ff.

Neisser, Wörterbuch = W. N., Zum Wörterbuch des Ṛgveda, 2 vol., Leipzig 1924-1930 (Nendeln 1966).

Oldenberg, Altind. Prosa = H. O., Zur Geschichte der altindischen Prosa, Berlin 1917.

Oldenberg, K.S. = H. O., Kleine Schriften, 2 vol., Wiesbaden 1967.

Oldenberg, Noten = H. O., Ṛgveda, Textkritische und exegetische Noten, 2 vol., Berlin 1909-1912.

Oldenberg, Prolegomena = H. O., Die Hymnen des Ṛigveda, I Metrische und textgeschichtliche Prolegomena, Berlin 1888.

Osthoff, see Brugmann.

Petr. Dict. = O. Böhtlingk und R. Roth, Sanskrit-Wörterbuch, 7 vol., St. Petersburg 1855-1875.

Pischel, Vedische Studien, see Geldner, Vedische Studien.

Pokorny, Wörterbuch = J. P., Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, Bern-München 1959-1968.

Reichelt, Elementarbuch = H. R., Awestisches Elementarbuch, Heidelberg 1909.

Renou, Bibliographie = L. R., Bibliographie védique, Paris 1931.

Renou, Études = L. R., Études de grammaire sanskrite, Paris 1936.

Renou, E.V.P. = L. R., Études védiques et pāṇinéennes, 17 vol., Paris 1955-1969.

Renou, Grammaire sanscrite = L. R., Grammaire sanscrite, 2 vol., Paris 1930.

Renou, Grammaire védique = L. R., Grammaire de la langue védique, Lyon-Paris 1952.

Renou (-Filliozat), Inde classique = L. R. and J. F., L'Inde classique, 2 vol., Paris 1947-1953.

Renou, Introduction générale = L. R., Introduction générale, Nouvelle édition du texte [of J. Wackernagel, Altindische Grammatik] paru en 1896, au tome I, Göttingen 1957.

Renou, Maîtres = L. R., Les maîtres de la philologie védique, Paris 1928.

De Saussure, Mémoire = F. de S., Mémoire sur le système primitif des voyelles dans les langues indo-européennes, Leipzig 1879 (also in Recueil des publications scientifiques de F. de S., Genève 1922).

Strunck, Nasalpräsentien = K. S., Nasalpräsentien und Aoriste, Heidelberg 1967.

Thieme, Fremdling = P. T., Der Fremdling im Ṛgveda, Leipzig 1938.
Thumb, Handbuch = A. T., Handbuch des Sanskrit, 2 vol., Heidelberg 1905.
Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch = Thumb, Handbuch, 3. stark umgearbeitete Aufla-
    ge von R. Hauschild, I, 1 and I, 2, Heidelberg 1958-1959.
Uhlenbeck, Wörterbuch = C.C. U., Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch der
    altindischen Sprache, Amsterdam 1898-1899.
Wackernagel (-Debrunner), Grammatik = J. Wackernagel, Altindische Grammatik,
    I, Göttingen 1896; II, 1, Göttingen 1905; II, 2 by A. Debrunner, Göttingen
    1954; III by J. W. and A. D., Göttingen 1930.
Wackernagel, Kleine Schriften = J. W., Kleine Schriften, 2 vol., Göttingen 1953.
Walde-Pokorny, Wörterbuch = A. W., Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indoger-
    manischen Sprachen, herausg. v. J. P., 3 vol., Berlin-Leipzig 1930-1932.
Whitney, Grammar = W.D. W., A Sanskrit grammar, ⁵Leipzig 1924.
Whitney, Roots = W.D. W., The roots, verb-forms and primary derivatives of the
    Sanskrit language, Leipzig 1885.
Wüst, Indisch = W. W., Erforschung der idg. Sprachen, IV, 1 Indisch in K. Brug-
    mann und A. Thumb, Grundriss der idg. Sprach- und Altertumskunde, Berlin-
    Leipzig 1929.
Wüst, PHMA = W. W., PHMA, Mitteilungen zur idg., vornehmlich indo-irani-
    schen Wortkunde ..., 12 vol., München 1955-1961.

II. PERIODICALS

Abh. Gött. Ges. Wiss. = Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft (Akademie) der Wissen-
    schaften, Göttingen.
A.B.O.R.I. = Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
A.J.P. = American Journal of Philology, Baltimore.
A.K.M. = Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, Leipzig.
A.L.B. = Adyar Library Bulletin, Adyar-Madras.
A.O. = Acta Orientalia, Leiden.
Arch. Ling. = Archivum linguisticum, Glasgow.
Arch. Or. = Archiv Orientálni, Prague.
B.B. = Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen (herausg. v. A. Bezzen-
    berger).
B.D.C.R.I. = Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute, Poona.
B.E.F.E.O. = Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient, Hanoi.
B.S.L. = Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris.
B.S.O.(A.) S. = Bulletin of the School of Oriental (and African) Studies, London.
G.G.A. = Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen, Göttingen (Berlin).
G.G.N. = Göttingische Gelehrte Nachrichten, Göttingen (Berlin).
I.A. = Indian Antiquary, Bombay.
I.F. = Indogermanische Forschungen, Strassburg (Berlin).
I.F.Anz. = Indogermanische Forschungen, Anzeiger, Strassburg (Berlin).
I.H.Q. = Indian Historical Quarterly, Calcutta.
I.I.J. = Indo-Iranian Journal, The Hague.
I.L. = Indian Linguistics, Calcutta.
J.A. = Journal asiatique, Paris.
J.A.O.S. = Journal of the American Oriental Society, New Haven.
J.A.S.B. = Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta.
J.B.B.R.A.S. = Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society (J. of
    the As. Soc., Bombay).
J.O.I.B. = Journal of the Oriental Institute, Baroda.

J.R.A.S. = Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, London.
K.Z. = Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indo-germanischen Sprachen (herausg. v. A. Kuhn), Berlin (Göttingen).
Language = L., Journal of the Linguistic Society of America, Baltimore.
M.I.S. = Münchener indologische Studien.
M.O. = Le monde oriental, Uppsala.
M.S.L. = Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris.
M.S.S. = Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft.
N.G. see G.G.N.
P.A.I.O.C. = Proceedings of the All India Oriental Conference.
P.A.O.S. = Proceedings American Oriental Society, New Haven.
P.B.B. = Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur (herausg. v. H. Paul und W. Braune), Halle a. S.
R.O. = Rocznik orientalistyczny, Kraków (Lwów, Warszawa).
T.A.P.A. = Transactions American Philological Association, Ithaca N.Y.
T.P.S. = Transactions of the Philological Society, London.
Vishv. Ind. J. = Vishveshvaranand Indological Journal, Hoshiarpur.
W.Z.K.M. = Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes.
Z.D.M.G. = Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Leipzig.
Z.I.I. = Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik, Leipzig.

III. GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliographie Linguistique publiée par le Comité International Permanent de Linguistes, Utrecht 1949-   .
R.N. Dandekar, Vedic Bibliography.
L. Renou, Bibliographie védique.

IV. TEXTS

AV.	= Atharvavedasaṃhitā	RV.	= Ṛgvedasaṃhitā
AiB.	= Aitareyabrāhmaṇa	ŚB.	= Śatapathabrāhmaṇa
BĀU.	= Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad	ŚŚS.	= Śāṅkhāyanaśrautasūtra
GB.	= Gopathabrāhmaṇa	TB.	= Taittirīyabrāhmaṇa
GS.	= Gṛhyasūtra	TS.	= Taittirīyasaṃhitā
JB.	= Jaiminīyabrāhmaṇa	VāsDhŚ.	= Vāsiṣṭhadharmaśāstra
KB.	= Kauṣītakibrāhmaṇa	YV.	= Yajurveda.
PB.	= Pañcaviṃśabrāhmaṇa		

V. LANGUAGES

Av.	= Avestan.	KhS.	= Khotanese (Indo-Scythian)
class.	= classical	Lat.	= Latin
Drav.	= Dravidian	M.I.A.	= Middle Indo-Aryan (Prākrits)
Gr.	= Greek		
Hitt.	= Hittite	N. Pers.	= New (Modern) Persian
I.A.	= Indo-Aryan	O.I.	= Old Indian
I.E.	= Indo-European	O. Pers.	= Old Persian
I. Ir.	= Indo-Iranian	Ved.	= Vedic

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The first scholar to provide the West with really reliable information on the Veda[1] was, in 1805, Henry Thomas Colebrooke (1765-1837).[2] The pioneers who, in the middle of the XIXth century made, as translators and editors, the texts accessible to a wider circle of scholars and paved the way for further research were E. Burnouf (1801-1852), H. H. Wilson (1784-1860), Max Müller (1823-1900) and others.[3] Their merits in the field of Indian philology cannot be commemorated here.[4] Their grammatical studies were largely founded on the results reached by their Indian predecessors who followed the Pāṇinean tradition of classical Sanskrit. Focussing his attention on the language as such, on a philologically exact study of the grammar, A. Régnier (1804-1884)[5] occupied himself also with the interpretation of Sāyaṇa's commentary, the relative importance of which he estimated fairly well. In the year 1852 Th. Benfey (1809-1881)[6] was the first to include in his Handbuch der Sanskritsprache the linguistic peculiarities of those parts of the Veda[7] to which he had access (the Sāmaveda and about one fourth of the Ṛgveda) and an account of the traditional matter of Pāṇini.

---

[1] For the preceding period see W. Caland, De ontdekkingsgeschiedenis van den Veda, Amsterdam Acad. 1918 (an English translation appeared in the Journal of Indian History 2 (1923), p. 127 ff).

[2] On the Vedas or sacred writings of the Hindus, in Asiatic Researches 8, p. 369 ff.

[3] For the history of Sanskrit philology in the XIXth century: E. Windisch, Geschichte der Sanskrit-Philologie, I, Strassburg 1917; II, Berlin-Leipzig 1920; L. Renou, Les maîtres de la philologie védique, Paris 1928. More specialized surveys are inter alia L. Heilmann, Per la storia degli studi indianistici in Italia, Bologna 1952; R. N. Dandekar, Twenty-five years of Vedic studies (1917-1942), in Progress of Indic studies, Poona 1942, p. 1 ff.; the same, Vedic, Sanskrit and Prakrit studies, in Oriental Studies in India, 26th Intern. Congress of Orientalists, New Delhi 1964; the same, Vedic religion and mythology, Publ. Centre Adv. Studies in Sanskrit, Poona, A 1, 1965. Most of the data and references contained in Fifty years of Soviet Oriental Studies (Brief reviews), U.S.S.R. Acad. Moscow 1968 are found also in the following pages.

[4] Bibliographies: L. Renou, Bibliographie védique, Paris 1931; (continued by) R. N. Dandekar, Vedic bibliography, Bombay 1946; Vedic bibliography, 2nd vol., Poona 1961.

[5] A. Régnier, Étude sur l'idiome des Védas et les origines de la langue sanscrite, I, Paris 1855: p. 6, on Sāyaṇa's commentary "que je suivrai, dans son interprétation, partout où il me semblera que la logique et la grammaire le permettent".

[6] For Bopp see Windisch, o.c., I, p. 72.

[7] For succinct surveys of the linguistic studies in the field of the Veda: H. Reichelt, Indisch, in Stand und Aufgaben der Sprachwissenschaft, Festschrift-W. Streitberg, Heidelberg 1924, p. 238 ff.; W. Wüst, Indisch, in Grundriss der indogermanischen Sprach- und Altertumskunde von K. Brugmann und A. Thumb, II, 4 Berlin-Leipzig 1929, p. 1 ff. Titles

It was W. D. Whitney (1827-1894)[1] who, between 1875 and 1879, made it his object to present the facts of the Sanskrit language primarily as they appear in the literature and to cast all statements, classifications, and so on, into a form consistent with the teachings of contemporaneous linguistic science. He included the language of the Veda, describing it much more fully than his predecessors and paying attention to its historical connection with the later language. Instead of special chapters on syntax he inserted paragraphs on the use of tenses, case forms, etc. His highly reliable, clear and well-arranged work (5th edition: 1924; 8th: 1955) has not lost its value. The first to break with the (Indian and European) tradition to treat Vedic grammar only in connection with Classical Sanskrit was A. A. Macdonell (1854-1930).[2] Like Whitney's his precise but dry work is non-comparative; from the linguistic point of view it is not free from imperfections.[3] A very useful abridged edition (1916; repeatedly republished) "for students" contains in addition to corresponding chapters on phonology, euphonic combination, declension, conjugation, indeclinables, stem formation and compounds also a section on syntax and some appendices. A 'Sketch of the historical grammar of the Rig and Atharva Vedas' was published by E. V. Arnold,[4] partly under the title 'Historical Vedic grammar'; it contained a special section on the development of the language during the Vedic period. When finished, J. Wackernagel's (1853-1938) grammar (volume I: 1896), successfully continued by A. Debrunner (1884-1958), will be in all respects the greatest linguistic handbook of Sanskrit (including Vedic) ever attempted. Being descriptive as well as comparative-historical in scope and containing copious bibliographic references this masterpiece of sound scholarship will for many years to come be a mine of information and a starting-point of new investigations.[5] A. Thumb's (1865-1915) comparative Handbuch des Sanskrit (1905) was less ambitious: emphasizing the classical language it incorporated information on the Veda mainly to bridge over the gulf between Sanskrit and Indo-European. The second edition (1930) was enlarged with partly unfelicitous additions by H. Hirt; the third (1958 f.), radically rewritten and amplified by R. Hauschild, is too comprehensive and expensive to be suitable for beginners, for whom it had been primarily

---

of books omitted in the following survey may be found in the bibliographies by Renou and Dandekar.

[1] Whitney, Grammar (1879).
[2] Macdonell, Vedic Grammar (1910).
[3] See R. Gauthiot, in B.S.L. 58, p. CCLXX.
[4] E. V. Arnold, in J.A.O.S. 18 (1897), p. 203 ff.
[5] For a more detailed appreciation see e.g. F. Edgerton, in J.A.O.S. 75 (1955), p. 56 ff.

designed.[1] L. Renou's (1896-1966) 'Grammaire de la langue védique' (1952) is historical only within its own frame of reference, noting linguistic changes within the Veda proper; focussing attention exclusively on the language of the mantras (no detail of which is neglected) and ignoring the relations with classical Sanskrit, it is non-comparative; while being wholly up to date and giving many references to text-places—which are fully translated—it is bibliographically inadequate; as it does not contain complete paradigms and lists of forms and is very concisely written it may in many places impress the reader as a collection of anomalies and singularities.[2] The Indo-Europeanist may however learn from it that the language of the metrical texts of the Veda is much more complicated than the simplifying impression given of it in handbooks of comparative linguistics.

Chapters on the Vedic language form part of two useful, though not in all respects felicitous, surveys of the history of Indo-Aryan in general which appeared in the thirties, one by the Belgian scholar J. Mansion,[3] the other, less readable, by Jules Bloch,[4] and in the very successful history of Sanskrit by Renou.[5] A book which is unsatisfactory in several respects was published by T. Burrow.[6] Far from being a reliable manual for beginners this one-sided and in many places disputable work abounds in personal opinions; while devoting too much attention to the prehistory of Sanskrit and even to questions of Proto-Indo-European, it neglects such subjects as syntax, style, and semantics. The apodictic presentation of facts rarely gives an inkling of the complicated nature of the problems, and the subjectivity in the choice of its problems and view-points are by no means counterbalanced by justifications, attempts to refute opposite views or references to different solutions, which are completely absent, as are footnotes. The inexperienced reader of this pleasantly written book will often fail to notice the weakness of the foundations of many an argument, the scarcity of the evidence adducible and the extent to which the interpretations offered are uncertain.

No historical survey will be attempted here of the considerable amount

---

[1] B. K. Ghosh, Linguistic introduction to Sanskrit, Calcutta 1939 deals also with the Indo-European origin of Sanskrit, Vedic and its relations to Avestan etc.

[2] Mention may also be made of L. Renou, Terminologie grammaticale du sanskrit, 3 vol., Paris 1942.

[3] J. Mansion, Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue sanscrite, Paris 1931.

[4] Bloch, L'Indo-aryen.

[5] L. Renou, Histoire de la langue sanskrite, Lyon-Paris 1956.

[6] T. Burrow, The Sanskrit language, London 1955 (a practically identical edition appeared in 1965). See for instances the reviews by E. Benveniste, in B.S.L. 51, 2, p. 24 ff.; P. Thieme, in Language, 3, p. 428 ff.; M. Leumann, in Kratylos, 1, p. 26 ff.; J. Gonda, in Lingua, 6, p. 287 ff.

of investigations pursued in this field as far as its results were published in monographs and articles. The most important work produced will be summarized in the systematic account of the progress of Old Indo-Aryan studies from the linguistic point of view which is to follow. It should, however, be noted that in the face of the abundance of material selections had to be made which were determined by the allotted space as well as by subjective standards of relative importance. Moreover, the reader will realize that in dealing with a field of inquiry so full of difficult problems some of which probably will never be solved or have for the time being found radically different solutions, the author, though pursuing objectivity, will in describing facts, selecting problems, judging solutions, and criticizing hypotheses express his own opinions.

For editions, translations, and secondary literature, I am referring the reader to the books and articles mentioned in the bibliographies and in the notes added to this survey; however, a very brief account of the principles adopted by the most prominent interpreters in explaining the Veda from the linguistic point of view may not be out of place here. Some of these (e.g. H. H. Wilson[1]) drew heavily on Sāyaṇa († 1387), believing that this commentator, in spite of the fact that he lived perhaps 25 centuries after the poets themselves, must have understood the Veda much better than modern scholars. Others (among whom was R. Roth, followed by Grassmann, Bergaigne, Oldenberg) were strongly inclined to hold the opposite view: since even Yāska and other ancient exegetes can be shown to have laboured under various misapprehensions, how could Sāyaṇa be supposed to have drawn reliable information from an unbroken and authentic tradition? With R. Pischel (1849-1908) and, especially in his earlier publications, K. F. Geldner (1852-1929), a reaction set in against the tendency which had been gaining ground as a result of the successful progress of Indo-European linguistics and the very important position ascribed by its students to Sanskrit, to explain Vedic one-sidedly from the point of view of comparative linguistics and comparative Indo-European mythology inaugurated by A. Kuhn (1812-1881) and others. Now, there is no denying that the commentaries attributed to Sāyaṇa bristle with linguistic mistakes: not infrequently, explanations of words and forms are erroneous, grammatical constructions impossible; there are many contradictions and anachronistic interpretations. However, his works are not completely worthless. We may learn from his mistakes; his inconsistencies could in part be due to the fact that he followed various traditions or authorities. The best way seems to be to read his

---

[1] whose translation of the Ṛgveda appeared between 1850 and 1888.

commentaries carefully and critically, to reject what we know to be impossible, to adopt that which is consistent with knowledge gathered from other sources and to note for reconsideration the information which cannot for the moment be checked. After H. Oldenberg (1854-1920), W. Caland (1859-1932) and others had seen that such new branches of learning as the general or comparative study of religions, general anthropology etc. might contribute much to a deeper understanding of the Veda, and after, in the first decades of the present century, the limitations of the methods adopted by the leading exponents of Indo-European comparative philology had become evident, many scholars evinced a felicitous aversion to methodical one-sidedness or, being themselves open to new ideas, came to co-operate, each in his particular way, in widening our horizon and improving our methods. That the results of the study of language in general ('Prinzipienlehre') were to a certain extent made subservient to these endeavours is worthy of special mention.

The scope of this publication does not permit to discuss and evaluate the contributions of the ancient indigenous grammarians to our knowledge of the Vedic language and the studies made of their approach and procedures.[1] One single problem may be mentioned. The periphrastic future which can hardly be regarded as Vedic, although its oldest occurrence, the middle 1st sing. in *-tāhe* (after *-tāham* instead of *-tāsmi*), in a late text points to its pre-existence, was—from his standpoint, correctly—analyzed by Pāṇini[2] as 'root + suffix *t(ās)* + ending', in the same manner as the *-sya-* future: *dā-sya-ti* "he will give". Western grammarians saw that *kartāsmi* "I shall make" from the historical point of view is a combination of an agent noun in *-tā* (nom.) + *asmi* "I am", but following their Indian predecessors in defining this category as primarily denoting processes to be done not nowadays *(anadyatane)* but in the future *(śvastanī)* or at a definite time to come or even in the remote future, they were either silent or disagreed on its special nuance. In reality this future, in harmony with its origin as a semi-nominal construction, emphasizes that a process is sure to take place, the idea of accomplishment being, at least originally, given prominence and the function of this category being explicable from a tendency to anticipate (fait-accompli): "if ., he is the conquerer" >

---

[1] The problem as to how far the authors of the hymns of the Ṛgveda were "grammatically conscious" was posed and answered in the negative by B. K. Ghosh, in Indian Culture (Calcutta), 15, p. 146 ff. Kunjunni Raja (in A.L.B. 19, p. 193 ff.) was (likewise) in the main right in arguing that even Yāska and Pāṇini did not fully appreciate the importance of "metaphorical transfer".

[2] Pāṇini, 3, 1, 33; 2, 4, 85; 3, 3, 15; 5 ff.; 135 ff.; R. Rocher, in Annali Istituto Or. Napoli, 6, p. 15 ff.

"if ..., he will certainly conquer".[1] On closer inspection it appears that already in the ṚV. the agent noun in predicative function was used to lay some emphasis on the performer of the process.

In this connection it may be recalled to mind that after the classical period of Indo-European linguistics (1875-1914) the methods adopted as well as the interest in their results gradually shifted from the so-called reconstruction of the parent language to the individual ancient languages. The latter, formerly often thoughtlessly regarded as agglomerates or conglomerates of more or less detached elements, now came to be seen as systems in their own right the elements of which are hierarchically arranged, with the result that the internal development of these languages began to demand greater attention. The method of internal reconstruction, which in the last decades was also applied to Vedic, led to remarkable successes which in a number of cases forced us to revise time-honoured convictions and opinions. Serious doubt was thrown upon the axiom of the 'originality' of Vedic, of its being (together with Homeric Greek, it is true) an exact, or at least reliable reflection of the Indo-European parent language. The relation between Vedic and Classical Sanskrit can no longer be regarded as being determined by a mere process of impoverishment and simplification. The problem of archaisms and innovations came to be much in the limelight.[2] From an internal reconstruction of the history of the Vedic language based on a careful and critical examination of all relevant facts we may gain a deeper insight into the development of Sanskrit and its relation to the so-called reconstructed Indo-European.

A serious source of errors inherent in any linguistic research directed on an ancient literature whatever its scope and contents is the element of chance.[3] How are we to know whether a word or a form which is rare or frequent in the texts was also rare or frequent in contemporaneous usage? How can we make certain about our suppositions and conclusions (archaisms, neologisms, 'Augenblicksbildung', elements of some 'technical Sondersprache' etc.)? That a thorough philological investigation

---

[1] For particulars: J. Gonda, in Lingua, 6, p. 158 ff. and compare also L. Renou, in B.S.L. 39 (1938), p. 103 ff.; E. Campanile, in Studi linguistici—V. Pisani, Brescia 1969, 1, p. 187 ff. For the fait-accompli see W. Havers, Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax, Heidelberg 1931, p. 41 ff.; 219 f.

[2] See further on and compare E. A. Makajev, Nominale Deklination im Vedischen und Sanskrit, in Voprosy jazykoznanija, 1964, 6, p. 94 ff.; the same in Pratidānam, Studies-F. B. J. Kuiper, The Hague 1968, p. 32 ff. (part of the views of this scholar, *inter alia* those concerning a 'hypertrophic paradigmatizing' of Vedic and its chronology, should however be checked by continued investigations). Certain phenomena are innovations rather than remains; see e.g. Narten, in Pratidānam, p. 9 ff.

[3] That much has been lost may also be inferred from casual references of the poets to works of their predecessors unknown to us (cf. e.g. ṚV. 1, 45, 3; 1, 89, 3; 3, 39, 2) (K. F. Geldner, Vedische Studien, II, p. 151).

should precede any linguistic exploration[1] is self-evident, but questions of chronology and provenance—not infrequently essential in a linguistic argumentation, but all too often neglected—are very often left undecided or completely unsolved. Whereas in particular cases there can be no doubt about the character of a rare form—for instance, *itsamāna-* instead of *icchámāna-* "wishing" betrays the hyper-correct Sanskritism—in other cases we may indeed hesitate to be affirmative. It may be true that K. B. 17, 7 *utgātodgāti* "the chanter chants" after the parallel *prastotā prastauti* "the prastotar (the chanter's assistant) chants the introduction" does not suffice to assume the existence of a complete root present *gā-ti* "he sings, recites in a singing manner",[2] but how are we to know for certain that this form and the complementary forms of the same paradigm were foreign to some technical or unrefined vocabulary, which for some reason or other had hardly access to our written texts? Anyhow, 'Augenblicks-bildungen', if recognized or suspected, and the like—e.g. the active -*s*- aor. *a-yok-ṣ-īt : yuj-* "to yoke"[3]—should be marked as such, not omitted. It is on the other hand quite clear that the older handbooks not rarely included word forms which a deeper or prolonged philological investigation proves to be corrupt, non-existent, or conditioned by a special occasion.

In endeavouring to identify features of Old Indo-Aryan with phenomena proper to living languages and better known written records and to explain them by means of solutions found, or hypotheses proposed, by specialists in other fields of linguistic inquiry,[4] we should not forget that Vedic in its different aspects presents itself as a conglomerate of a peculiar sort of idioms. The language of the Ṛgveda as we know it, though ultimately based on normal speech, has no doubt been highly moulded by the poetical traditions of those who used it as a vehicle of their thought. That means that, for instance, rhythmic and metrical influences have played some part in forming or transforming words. Thus, the compound *puram-dara-* "destroyer of strongholds" was preferred to the form **pūr-dara-* (cf. *pūr-bhid-* "breaking down strongholds"), no doubt because the quadrisyllabic form answered to a common rhythmic schema.[5] Yet one

---

[1] The linguist should for instance not avoid studying variants (cf. e.g. Narten, Sigmatische Aoriste, p. 113; 119).

[2] Narten, Verb, p. 121.

[3] Narten, Sigmatische Aoriste, p. 215.

[4] For instance "the tendency to avoid ambiguity" may be supposed to have led to the introduction of the 1st sing. of the medial periphrastic future *yaṣṭā́he* formed on the model of *yaṣṭā́ham* "I shall worship" which was used beside *yaṣṭā́smi* (*yáṣṭā* + *ahám* "I" or *asmi* "I am"); a form **yaṣṭā́se* could have been understood as a 2nd person, which indeed occurs (J. Schmidt, in Festschrift-A. Weber, Leipzig 1896, p. 17 f.).

[5] Renou, in B.S.L. 61, p. 3.

should be careful. The spread of the type *juhóta(na)*, 2nd plur. imper. act. of *hu-* "to sacrifice", instead of *ju-hu-ta(na)* has been explained as originating in rhythmic tendencies;[1] but why did this tendency affect only forms with the vowel *u*? That the result was not **juhūtana* is, of course, due to the strong forms with *ju-ho-*.

Provided we always realize the hypothetical character of our deductions and suppositions and bear in mind that complicated hypotheses may involve a greater probability of error, we may also ask ourselves to what extent the function of a form may play a part in the processes of analogy, transformation, obsolescence etc. It has for instance been argued[2] that the double function of the middle present forms of *śru-*, viz. "be heard" and "be famous", the second value being also that of the perfect, may enable us to consider the creation of a 2nd sing. of the middle present *śṛṇviṣé* to represent the harmonizing of the morphological characteristic (ending *-iṣe*) with the 'stative' value of this new form which is based on forms of the perfect.

Another problem is presented by the contents of the texts. That the comparatively limited number of injunctives in the IXth book of the Ṛgveda has something to do with its topical subject-matter[3] seems evident, but it is difficult, and for the time being in many cases impossible, to decide how far we can go in connecting the contents of the texts and the modes of their grammatical expression. Yet there is no harm in observing that Vedic presents a large collection of more or less frequent forms occurring in a number of texts of one-sided and specialized contents and fulfilling their function within the framework of these texts.[4]

Scholars are long since agreed that the linguistic material of the Ṛgveda as a whole is more ancient (XIIth century and after[5]), extensive, and authentic than that of the other saṃhitās which borrow largely from it; that, after a long period of oral transmission during which it did not remain unaltered, the text of the Ṛgveda must—in the time elapsing between the oldest brāhmaṇa compilations and Pāṇini—have been 'edited' and established by diaskeuasts whose activity, in our so-called saṃhitā text, left many traces such as deviations from the original metre and sandhi,[6] disregard of cases of anaptyxis, replacement of older forms

---

[1] Bloomfield, in A.J.P. 5, p. 8.

[2] G. Cardona, in Language, 37 (1961), p. 338 ff.

[3] K. Hoffmann, Der Injunktiv im Veda, Heidelberg 1967, p. 36 f.

[4] Cf. Renou in I.F. 70, p. 218.

[5] I refer to the bibliographies in Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, I, 1, p. 129 f., and Renou, Introduction générale, p. 43 f. (n. 3). See also Renou, Histoire de la langue sanskrite, Lyon-Paris 1956, p. 10 ff.

[6] Thus the words *devánāṃ jánma* in ṚV. 6, 51, 2 should for metrical reasons be read

by younger ones and other modernizations or (artificial) generalizations;[1] that considering—without really reliable method and indicia, it is true— contents, metre,[2] arrangement,[3] language,[4] style,[5] etc. not all ten books of the Ṛgveda are assumed to date back to the same age, the Xth book being[6] generally regarded as the youngest,[7] most other books however giving occasion to much diversity of opinion;[8] that Ṛgveda X, Atharvaveda[9]—some part of which may be rooted in high antiquity[10]—, and Yajurveda favouring definite phonetic habits, forms, and expressions of the prose parts of the Veda linguistically speaking are a transition to, or more closely related to, younger Vedic, on the understanding that, although the Atharvaveda as a corpus is younger than the Ṛgveda, parts of it are no doubt older than the youngest texts of the latter corpus.[11]

---

deváñ jánma, a formula ("the race of the gods") exhibiting an old form of the gen. plur. (cf. in Old Latin *deum* < *deōm*, replaced by *deorum* "of the gods"). Kuhn (in A. Kuhn und A. Schleicher, Beiträge zur vergleichenden Sprachforschung, 4, p. 180) and other scholars saw that the ending *-ām* of this gen. plur. has in about one-third of its occurrences in the ṚV. a dissyllabic value; as the same phenomenon is found in the Avesta and the accent of Greek -ῶν points to contraction of two vowels this dissyllabic value is no doubt original. In a number of cases augmented verb-forms obviously were read as *aïcchaḥ* (ṚV. 10, 108, 5) instead of *aïcchaḥ*.

[1] For other particulars see Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. X ff. and Renou's notes in Introduction générale, for some bibliographical references also Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, I, 1, p. 131 ff.

[2] E. V. Arnold, Vedic metre in its historical development, Cambridge 1905 tried to fix the internal chronology of the Ṛgveda.

[3] Oldenberg, Prolegomena, p. 191 ff. M. Bloomfield, Rig-veda repetitions, Cambridge Mass. 1916, ch. V (p. 634 ff.) studied the relative chronology in connection with the repetition of formulas with or without variation. His thesis "repetitions are often more or less conscious imitations and frequently so clearly inferior in structure and style as to furnish fairly good criteria for the relative age of the passages concerned" is however a generalization which requires qualification.

[4] H. Brunnhofer, Ueber Dialektspuren im vedischen Gebrauch der Infinitivformen, in K.Z. 25, p. 329 ff. was convinced that a preference for the use of so-called infinitive forms (*-dhyai* being the oldest, *-ase, -tum* etc. being younger) could enable us to arrange the families of poets in a definite order: Gautama, Bharadvāja (VI), Vasiṣṭha (VII), Atri (V), Viśvāmitra (III), … Kaṇva (VIII, 1-56). P. Poucha, in Arch. Or. 13, p. 103 ff.; 225 ff.; 15, p. 65 ff. attached much value to statistics of rare words etc.

[5] W. Wüst, Stilgeschichte und Chronologie des Ṛgveda, Leipzig 1928, basing himself on grammatical and stylistic forms or phenomena (including epithets etc.) of 'typological' value.

[6] Since R. Roth, Ueber den Atharva Veda, Tübinger Universitätsschrift 1856, 5, p. 18; see Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. XIII f.

[7] For a survey of the relevant linguistic facts: Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. XIV (with n. 44-55 of Renou, Introduction générale). See also Oldenberg, Prolegomena, p. 265 ff.

[8] According to Wüst book IX is the oldest, IV very old, I young etc.; VIII is very controversial, etc. (see Renou, Introduction générale, p. 52, n. 58).

[9] Arnold, in J.A.O.S. 22, p. 309 ff.

[10] One should not confuse the chronology of the particular texts, that of the collections of texts and that of the individual linguistic forms. See e.g. the polemical articles by H. Oldenberg, in Z.D.M.G. 54, p. 181 ff. and E. V. Arnold, in J.A.O.S. 22 (1901), p. 309 ff., combatting M. Bloomfield's view that the language of the Atharvaveda is not chronologically later than that of the Ṛgveda.

[11] Compare, in general, also Renou, Les écoles védiques et la formation du Veda, Paris 1947.

Passages and parts of texts containing forms and words which are strangers to the diction of the hieratic hymns are not necessarily late.

A few words may be inserted here on the two forms of the traditional text of the Ṛgveda: that by complete utterances *(saṃhitā-pāṭha)* and that with utterances analyzed into separate words *(pada-pāṭha)*. The linguistic analysis presupposed by this twofold edition of the corpus is provided by the treatise called Ṛgveda-prātiśākhya (of unknown date[1]). This treatise raises a question of special linguistic interest: how did the authors know that with regard to the semivowels affected by the so-called rule of Sievers and Edgerton,[2] the 'classical' pronunciation of the 'edited' text deviated from the original pronunciation of the poets?[3] Was this knowledge handed down or was it a result of theoretical considerations based on the study of metrics and phonology?

As compared with the Ṛgveda the language of the younger Vedic texts[4] was considerably simplified,[5] mainly because of various losses. Although the nominal formations were a little less liable to change or loss than of the verb, the root nouns tend to disappear sooner than the verbs of the root class. The subjunctive of the 2nd and 3rd persons falls into disuse;[6] of the twelve or more so-called infinitives only that in *-tum* survives, of the absolutives only that in *-tvá*,[7] and in many other cases duplication is drastically reduced: thus the ending *-masi* (beside *-mas*) of the 1st plur. active disappears and the numerous 3rd plur. forms with *r* come to be limited to the optative, the perfect and the verb *śī-* "to lie", etc., etc. In view of the history of the Vedic texts it is on the other hand not surprising that sometimes forms linguistically belonging to different stages of development occur in the same document.[8] The poets could not avoid adapting, in a greater or less degree, their language to that of their environment.[9] These facts as well as the obvious dislike of the poets belonging to definite families to particular grammatical forms

[1] For particulars: L. Renou (et J. Filliozat), L'Inde classique, I, Paris 1947, p. 305.
[2] See chapter II, p. 35 f.
[3] For a bibliography see Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. 202.
[4] It may be recalled that although the Veda is allegedly transmitted with scrupulous care, there are exceptions: Renou, in Vāk, I, p. 88 ff.
[5] For a statistical comparison between the Ṛgveda and the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa see J. Avery, in J.A.O.S. 10, p. 319 ff.
[6] Renou, La décadence et la disparition du subjonctif, in Monographies sanskrites, I, Paris 1937.
[7] I refer to the note in Renou, Introduction générale, p. 61, n. 147.
[8] Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, I, 1, p. 94.
[9] Compare also the survey of remarkable linguistic features at the time made by A. Ludwig, Der Rigveda, VI, Prag-Leipzig 1888, p. 240 ff.

(so-called infinitives in -*tu*- etc.)[1] do not however suffice to create the impression of serious lack of uniformity.

Another characteristic of the younger parts of the Ṛgveda is the tendency to archaizing; however, it is difficult to decide to what extent the poets consciously endeavoured "ihrer Diktion durch gesuchte Abweichungen vom gewöhnlichen Sprachgebrauch einen künstlichen Charakter zu geben".[2] We should however guard against the misunderstanding that all deviations from standard usage represent archaisms. The curious -*śmaśáru*- occurring ṚV. 10, 96, 8 instead of *śmáśru*- "beard" rather is a "Spielvariante"[3] suggested by the existence of words in -*āru*-.[4]

It has recently been emphasized[5] that sometimes there is a greater chance that an unusual form merely presents the results of poetic licence and is therefore not suited to be used for comparative purposes; especially if the forms under consideration are incomprehensible in the light of generally adopted linguistic methods or if they are beyond the normal possibilities, it is no doubt warranted to take, with due reserve and prudence, such licence into account. The intricate phenomenon of artificial innovations is complicated by the possibility of expressions which do not reveal their true character by their outward form. Scholars who like to argue this difficulty on strictly chronological lines are liable to simplify the problems. I for one am inclined to question, for instance, the correctness of the opinion[6] that the aorist *a-prāt* "he filled" (AV., TB.), because it is not found in the ṚV. (which only knows sigmatic aorists), does not regularly continue an I.E. root aorist *(e-)plēt*[7]—in this case inferred only from Greek πλῆτο. Even if *aprāt* were an innovation, why should it be without basis in linguistic reality ("nicht sprachwirklich")? Why should the idiomatic differences between ṚV. and AV. etc. be ignored and the possibility of some dialectal peculiarity excluded? The latter alternative would free us also from another complication: the Ṛgvedic -*s*- aorist itself has been explained as an innovation.[8] It is therefore not surprising that the complex situation of the Ṛgveda, its isolated character, the uniqueness of the collection of the words and forms which

---

[1] Wackernagel, Grammatik, p. XIII, and Renou, Introduction générale, p. 50, n. 42.
[2] Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. XV. See also Hopkins, in J.A.O.S. 17, p. 25.
[3] Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, II, 2, p. 288.
[4] Cf. Chr. Bartholomae, Studien zur indogermanischen Sprachgeschichte, II, Halle 1891, p. 175. Compare however also Renou, Introduction générale, p. 52, n. 60.
[5] Renou, in B.S.L. 61 (1966), p. 2 f.; see also Oldenberg, in Z.D.M.G. 60, p. 115 ff.; 61, p. 126 ff.; 62, p. 478 ff.
[6] Strunk, Nasalpräsentien, p. 40 ff.; Narten, Verb, p. 116 f.
[7] Cf. H. Oertel, in Festgabe-H. Jacobi, Bonn 1926, p. 20; Pokorny, Wörterbuch, p. 799 etc.
[8] Leumann, Neuerungen, p. 29 f.; Narten, Sigmatische Aoriste, p. 19; 173.

constitute its 'language', the presence of real or pseudo-archaisms, of anomalies, of experiments of individual poets should force us to ask ourselves constantly if, and to what extent, each noteworthy word, form, or construction may be utilized for linguistic conclusions to be drawn.[1]

Philologists agree on some further points of linguistic interest: the production of the extensive masses of Vedic prose[2] must have been a process of centuries, the resultative or narrative function of the perfect sometimes being considered an important—though unreliable—criterion of the relative antiquity of the texts;[3] the language of the prose texts was gradually developing into Sanskrit, although the āraṇyakas and upaniṣads exhibit some pre-classical peculiarities which will become exceptional in the sūtras.[4] The language of these briefly worded prose texts is not, however, completely identical with the Sanskrit as described by the grammarians:[5] there are traditional peculiarities, licence with regard to sandhi, deviations ascribed to the 'ignorance' of the authors.[6]

In the course of time it became clear that matters are more complicated: stylistic factors and subject-matter for instance were apt to interfere with a normal development;[7] the criterion of the relative frequency of ancient and modern equivalent grammatical forms by which to judge the age of different Vedic texts[8] is disputable because of the secondary or imitative character of some passages; early forms do not necessarily prove early authorship, and therefore a younger text may contain linguistically older forms.[9] For instance, śere, 3 plur. ind. of śī- "to lie" (= AV. śoire), does not occur before the Atharvaveda; and more forms looked upon as indicative of late date may in reality be older. Any argumentation one-sidedly built on chronological considerations is therefore apt to become illusive: "C'est surtout par des critères internes et au terme d'un raisonnement appliqué à chaque forme que se décide l'appartenance à un type ancien, l'authenticité, ou, au contraire, la réfection, la secondarité réductrice

---

[1] Renou, in B.S.L. 61, p. 1 ff.

[2] H. Oldenberg, Zur Geschichte der altindischen Prosa, Ab. Ges. Wiss. Göttingen, N.F. 16, 6 (1917).

[3] I refer to Renou, Introduction générale, p. 68, n. 195.

[4] For some particulars see the bibliographical note in Renou, Introduction générale, p. 72, n. 231.

[5] For particulars Renou, Introduction générale, p. 15 f. with the notes 215 ff.

[6] See e.g. G. Bühler, The sacred laws of the Āryas, I, Oxford 1896, p. XLIII ff. We should however beware of exaggeration and not impute to the author what may rather be short-comings of those who handed down his works; see O. Boehtlingk, in Z.D.M.G. 39, p. 517 f. (and Bühler, ibidem, 40, p. 534).

[7] M. Bloomfield, in J.A.O.S. 21, p. 42 ff.; Geldner, Vedische Studien, III, p. 99.

[8] Ch. R. Lanman, in J.A.O.S. 10, p. 576; see also Arnold, in J.A.O.S. 18, p. 203 ff. passim.

[9] E. W. Hopkins, in J.A.O.S. 17, p. 25; M. Leumann, Neuerungen, p. 11.

ou novatrice".[1] In the brāhmaṇas it is the metrical passages, the so-called gāthās,[2] which are characterized by archaisms.[3] After closer investigation however, it appears that we would be more precise to say that as far they are eulogistic these passages are composed in an elaborated pseudo-Vedic style, as far as they point a moral or represent the type brahmodya,[4] i.e. relate to sacred problems, they verge on a free, partly popular, non-Vedic idiom.[5] Therefore, and because the author quotes many stanzas from older works, an indiscriminate collection of the verb forms found in the brāhmaṇas would "most unfairly represent the language of the period when it was composed".[6] It would on the other hand be a mistake to assume that the prose of these works furnishes a closer approximation to prehistoric usage than the metrical texts just because as prose it must be more akin to normal forms of speech.

Moreover, parts of the developments are not to be regarded as purely linguistic processes but rather as events of socio-linguistic order. The idiom of the mantras was no doubt based on the language of a more archaic milieu, characterized by a less evolved mentality. The 'progress of civilization', however slight in our eyes, the political and economic adventures of the Aryan communities during and after the conquest of large tracts in the North-West and the settlement of new countries, their contacts with foreign peoples and the more or less successful attempts at adapting themselves to their new surroundings must have left their traces on their way of speaking. The apparently rapid decline of the injunctive after the period of the metrical texts (mantras) has for instance been accounted for[7] by the consideration that ancient Vedic prose was founded on the spoken language of a later stage of development than that which must have been the foundation of the idiom represented by the mantras.

After A. Kuhn (1812-1881)[8] had, in the year 1853, seen the parallelism between, and probably historical identity of, Gr. (Homer) κλέος ἄφθιτον and Ṛgvedic śrávo ... ákṣitam "imperishable renown", many scholars contributed a considerable number of similar parallels from which it has

---

[1] Renou, in I.F. 70, p. 217.
[2] P. Horsch, Die vedische Gāthā- und Śloka-Literatur, Bern 1966.
[3] Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. XXXI; Renou, Introduction générale, p. 15 and p. 69, n. 210; H. Oldenberg, Altindische Prosa, p. 33 ff.; U. N. Ghoshal, in I.H.Q. 18, p. 93 ff. on texts incorporated in the rituals of some of the great sacrifices.
[4] See Renou, in J.A. 237, p. 7 ff.; Gonda, Brahman, p. 57 ff.
[5] Renou, in Asiatica, Festschrift-F. Weller, Leipzig 1954, p. 534.
[6] Avery, in J.A.O.S. 10, p. 221.
[7] Gonda, Moods, p. 37.
[8] A. Kuhn, in K.Z. 2, p. 467.

in the course of time become clear that the Vedic poets were able to draw on a poetical tradition which had retained a certain number of formulas, phrases, expressions that with some probability may be held to have been inherited from the period of the Indo-European unity.[1] Several of these features can, moreover, be shown to have been characteristic of the literary art of the common Indo-Iranian period.[2] In any case, the literature of the Ṛgveda is highly traditional. It has even with some exaggeration been said that it was almost impossible for a later poet to compose a hymn to a definite god without imitating his predecessors,[3] but we should realize that 'formulae' play a prominent part in all oral literature the beginnings of which are lost for us in a remote and unrecorded past.

It is only in accordance with this view that already far back in the preceding century scholars arrived at the conclusion that the Ṛgveda was not composed in the spoken language of the Aryan community—and still less in a naive ungrammatical idiom of hoary antiquity—but in what is usually called an 'artificial' idiom,[4] an exact definition of that term, however, being as a rule omitted and the degree of 'artificiality' remaining controversial:[5] some scholars[6] expressed themselves in measured terms whereas others did not hesitate to emphasize the unnatural character of this language. Bergaigne[7] for instance fell into the error of regarding this body of literature as a mere string of rhetorical subtleties and delicacies originating in milieus of priests, as a product of bizarre and eccentric rhetoric; Geldner[8] liked to speak of "schöne, glänzende Rede, also ... Kunstpoesie" and in recent times Renou opined that "on peut admettre que la langue était semi-populaire, le style étant intensément artificiel".[9]

---

[1] For details and the history of the relevant research: R. Schmitt, Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit, Wiesbaden 1967. Particulars should be discussed in a chapter on style. It may suffice here to recall that not all parallels can unequivocally be regarded as continuing one and the same original expression. See e.g. B. Schlerath's criticism (in II. Fachtagung für idg. und allg. Sprachwissenschaft, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft, Sonderheft 15 (1962), p. 139 ff.) of the conclusions drawn since Kuhn, K.Z. 13 (1864), p. 49 ff.; 113 ff. with regard to typologically related German and Vedic magical formulas.

[2] See for instance also Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, III, p. 125 f.; 127.

[3] Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. XVI; M. Bloomfield, Rig-Veda repetitions, I, Cambridge Mass. 1916, p. 19.

[4] A. Régnier, Etude sur l'idiome des Vedas et les origines de la langue sanscrite, I, Paris 1855, p. 81; 200 expressed the opposite opinion.

[5] See Benfey, in Abh. Gött. Ges. Wiss. 16 (1871-72), p. 131 ff.; P. v. Bradke, in Z.D.M.G. 40, p. 669 ff.; J. Zubatý, in W.Z.K.M. 2, p. 137 ff. and many others.

[6] e.g. M. Winternitz, Geschichte der indischen Literatur, I², Leipzig 1907, p. 79 etc. Benfey, o.c., supposed an artificial language which, it is true, was based on a spoken language, from which it, however, had dissociated itself to such a degree that it did no longer answer to any living idiom.

[7] A. Bergaigne, in M.S.L. 4 (1881), p. 96.

[8] Geldner, Vedische Studien, III, p. 99, n. 5.

[9] Renou, Introduction générale, p. 52, n. 66. Compare the same, Hymnes spéculatifs du

It might be feasible to describe the language of the mantras as follows: It is ultimately based on the normal spoken language of the period—or, rather, in many respects, on that spoken by those groups of the ancient Aryan society to which belonged the poets (who must have had predecessors)[1] and their audience in the period which must, because of its many real archaisms,[2] have been anterior to the fixation of the texts; while retaining various peculiarities, it constitutes a choice of the total amount of grammatical forms, words, etc. determined by the nature of the texts and the traditions and interests of the poets as well as a hypertrophy of a considerable number of syntactic and stylistic elements proper to oral religious poetry in general and to the special poetical tradition of the ancient ṛṣis in particular.[3] It is, however difficult to decide to what extent the Vedic language was already in the time of the composition of the hymns distinctly hieratic, archaizing, and artificial, and to what extent the poets occasionally violated, from ignorance, the phonetic rules of the language they used.[4] On the other hand, scholars are agreed that this language in the centuries to follow did not undergo a natural development. Transmitted from father to son,[5] from teacher to pupil in brahmanical families,[6] the texts became their patrimony to be preserved unaltered.[7] Although one should not suppose these brahmans to have conversed in the idiom of their texts—on the contrary, Pāṇini[8] was to describe the

---

Véda, Paris 1956, p. 7 "La langue des hymnes est ... très éloigné ..., par le style, d'une langue parlée".

[1] See also v. Bradke, in Z.D.M.G. 40, p. 669.

[2] Wüst, Stilgeschichte, passim; for a bibliography: Renou, Introduction générale, p. 491, n. 30.

[3] It would be interesting to take up the distinction made in dealing with the development of the pre-classical language by Arnold (in J.A.O.S. 18, p. 245 ff.) between the main current of change and the 'eddies'.

[4] as is Edgerton's opinion (in Language, 10, p. 241).

[5] Geldner, Vedische Studien, III, p. 159; G. Bühler, Vikramāṅkadevacarita, Bombay 1875, Introd. p. 17.

[6] P. v. Bradke, Beiträge zur Kenntniss der vorhistorischen Entwicklung unseres Sprachstammes, Giessen 1888, p. 9; H. Jacobi, in Scientia, Bologna 1913, p. 251 ff.; L. de la Vallée Poussin, Indo-européens et Indo-iraniens, Paris 1936, p. 192 f.; 394 ff.

[7] J. Mansion, Le sanskrit védique, langue morte, in Mélanges de philologie orientale, Liège 1932, p. 135 ff. Compare Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, I, 1, p. 93 defining "Kunstsprache": "d.h. (die) brahmanische Standessprache, die im engen Kreis priesterlicher Sänger vererbt und in ihrer Altertümlichkeit wissentlich erhalten wurde".

[8] In this survey the progress of the research concerning the indigenous grammarians will not be included, although many of Pāṇini's 'rules' deal with the language of the Veda, regarding this rather as a deviation from the norm described which represents a half-literary half-spoken stage of development not much different from the language of the Vedic sūtras. For a succinct bibliography see Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, I, 1, p. 161 ff. Special mention, however, may be made of the very useful publications by B. Liebich, Zur Einführung in die indische einheimische Sprachwissenschaft, in Sitzungsber. Heidelberger Akad. d. Wiss. 1919-20 (4 fascicules), and of P. Thieme, Pāṇini and the Veda, Allahabad

typically Vedic idiom as a collection of exceptions—, the very fact that
during the performance of rites vulgar expressions had to be avoided—
even those who in daily life were inclined to incorrect speech refrained
from making mistakes[1]—must have constituted a stabilizing factor
contributing to the development of the brahmanical 'class language'
Sanskrit. Anyhow, in many linguistic points, generally speaking, there is
a line of cleavage between the Veda and the Sanskrit of later times,
although of course the two periods shade into each other. Thus the langu-
age of the youngest divisions of the Vedic literature, for instance that of
the oldest upaniṣads, in many respects agrees more closely with the usage
of the Mahābhārata than with that of the older brāhmaṇas.

At this point we are confronted with the complex problem of the Vedic
dialects which has for many years occasioned much debate. Different
from Sanskrit which in principle is written in accordance with the
prescripts of the grammarians—among whom Pāṇini occupies the first
place—Vedic is not a unified language. Even within the Ṛgveda it
exhibits linguistic features which can only be explained on the assumption
of slightly different dialects. Pāṇini, while describing, presumably, a
dialect of Northwestern India,[2] mentions geographical variants and
although these, it is true, do not enable us to identify definite dialects or
isoglosses,[3] the very fact of their existence corroborates what we can infer
from the Vedic texts themselves.

The relationship between the 'extreme' Vedic of the Ṛgveda and
Classical Sanskrit and other subjects which lie beyond the scope of this
book must be left out of consideration.[4] It may suffice to recall that
opinions are divided, for instance with regard to the question as to what
extent the difference between both forms of Indo-Aryan may be regarded
as representing a direct development from Vedic to Classical Sanskrit—in
most cases involving loss or simplification—and they may be ascribed to
an invasion of the literary language by popular or vernacular speech
habits, the existence of which is not only probable, but is well attested for
a later period.[5] The supposition that the hymns were composed in the

---

1935. See also Renou, Introduction générale, p. 72, n. 232: bibliographical references to the
relations between Pāṇini and the upaniṣads, the sūtras etc.
  [1] Patañjali, Mah. 1, 1, 1; 5, 9.
  [2] Agrawala, India as known to Pāṇini, Lucknow 1953, p. 37 f.
  [3] Renou, Histoire de la langue sanskrite, Lyon-Paris 1956, p. 67.
  [4] H. Reichelt, Indisch, in Festschrift-W. Streitberg, Heidelberg 1924, p. 238 ff.; Wüst,
Indisch; M. B. Emeneau, The dialects of Old Indo-Aryan, in H. Birnbaum and J. Puhvel,
Ancient Indo-European dialects, Berkeley-Los Angeles 1966, p. 123 ff.
  [5] Pāṇini, 3, 1, 35; 3, 2, 106; 108; 3, 4, 6; 4, 1, 29; 62; 4, 3, 22; 6, 1, 122; 181; 6, 2, 164;
6, 3, 20.

"idiom spoken by the people"[1] found hardly any supporters and was rightly combatted by Wackernagel[2] and others.

A theory was put forward that there existed side by side two (literary) 'dialects', a 'hieratic' one and a 'popular', the former being used in adoring the gods etc. and "related more closely to that dialect or those dialects" which are at the base of the language of the brāhmaṇas and the later literature in general, the latter preferred for instance in the charms[3] of the Atharvaveda and characterized by a higher degree of "closeness to the popular dialect or style of diction." As regards the general tenor of this theory, it no doubt has much to recommend it: a given form which begins to crop up in the more 'popular' collection of the Atharvaveda need not necessarily be of recent origin. We had, however, better avoid the term 'dialect'. Geographic and chronological differences may according to what may seem the most probable assumption have combined with differences due to the traditional style or diction of a genre, to social factors,[4] to the different choice of the possibilities proper to the language that, in general, was made by the poets of a given type of composition.

It is long since definitely established that the assumption that Classical Sanskrit is genetically derivable from the language of the oldest Vedic texts is untenable; the relevant evidence points in the opposite direction: the language of the R̥gveda is not the direct ancestor of post-Vedic Sanskrit. For instance, the R̥gveda has innovations in the declension of the nouns such as the nom. pl. masc. in -*āsas*, which do not occur in the later language in which the more original -*ās*—not foreign to the R̥gveda but, to mend defective metre, often to be read -*ās-as*—is the only form.[5] The same observation applies to the primary verbal ending of the 1st plur. -*masi* (as against I.E. -*me/os*). Another characteristic of the R̥gveda[6] is the transition of an intervocalic *ḍ* into *ḷ* (e.g. *iḷā* "libation, etc."). The assumption of one or more dialects with at least several features which are more archaic than the corresponding phenomena in the R̥gveda is e.g. necessary to account for the classical instr. pl. of I.E. thematic stems (-*e/o*- stems), viz. -*ais* which is also found in Greek, Latin, etc., beside R̥gvedic -*ais* and -*ebhis*.[7] The existence of dialects is also attested by Pāṇini, whose work, as already intimated, contains many references to

---

[1] A. Regnier, Etude sur l'idiome des Védas, Paris 1855, p. 81 ff.
[2] Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. XVII; cf. p. XXXVII etc.
[3] M. Bloomfield, The Atharva Veda and the Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa, Strassburg 1899, p. 46.
[4] For the importance of these see also Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. XIX; XXII.
[5] C. R. Lanman, in J.A.O.S. 10 (1878), p. 345; Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, III, p. 100.
[6] Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. 255 f.; Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, I, 1, p. 282.
[7] See e.g. A. Meillet, in I.F. 31, p. 124; Reichelt, o.c., p. 239.

peculiarities of the Easterners and the Northerners.[1] Moreover, the importance of a Kashmir tradition of the Ṛgveda[2] appears not only from a number of variants which are well worth considering, but also from some interesting differences in the orthography which point, or might point, to phonetic differences in the language itself: final s, not ḥ, before an initial surd consonant in external sandhi; simplification of geminate consonants before or after a consonant (incidentally also in the traditional ṚV., and in the Veda in general); remainders of some ancient phonetic orthography in cases such as *yá tvám* instead of *yát tvám;* confusion of ś and ṣ, etc. The conclusion must therefore be that in the Ṛgvedic period there existed, in the North-West of India,[3] several closely related dialects one of which was the basic dialect of the oldest corpus, another being basically, or as far as some of its main characteristics were concerned, the ancestor of Classical Sanskrit. Most scholars nowadays agree that the main features of the Classical system had already come into existence before the Ṛgveda received the form in which we possess it.

On the strength of such examples as are quoted above (-*ais* beside -*ebhis* in the same corpus etc.) the implication is evident: taken as a whole the oldest texts represent a mixed dialect,[4] one of the elements of which must have been near to what was to become Classical Sanskrit. In any case this assumption accounts for the curious occurrence of the neuter of the interrogative pronoun *kim* beside *kad* in the Ṛgveda.[5] Yet it does not necessarily mean that all (or the) composers of the older hymns of the Ṛgveda must have been speakers of many dialects.[6] Most probably North India was, in Vedic times, a large dialect area, part of whose speakers were to a considerable degree unified by a common culture, a fact which may have contributed to interborrowing of speech features.

Another assumption that seems necessary to be made would be that outside the typically 'Vedic' socio-religious milieu there were other cognate dialects. A third probability[7] is that those speakers of a dialecti-

---

[1] Cf. Pāṇini, 4, 1, 43; 130; 153; 157; 160; 4, 2, 74; 7, 3, 14; 24. See also Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. XLIV; Renou, Introduction générale, p. 88 f., n. 324 ff. For Pāṇini and the problem of the "spoken language": Renou, Histoire, p. 62 ff. (with bibliographical references).

[2] J. Scheftelowitz, Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda, Breslau 1906, p. 32 ff.; 190; the same, in W.Z.K.M. 21, p. 85 ff. See also Renou, Introduction générale, p. 49, n. 40.

[3] Cf. Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa 7, 6: "In the North (i.e. North-West) speech is uttered with more discernment, and men go northwards to learn the language". See also Wackernagel, Grammatik, p. XXI f.

[4] e.g. Meillet, in I.F. 31, p. 120 ff.; Reichelt, o.c., p. 240.

[5] P. Tedesco, in Language, 21 (1945), p. 128 ff.; Emeneau, o.c., p. 130 f.

[6] Compare Emeneau's opinion (o.c., p. 127).

[7] Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, I, 1, p. 96; K. Ammer, in W.Z.K.M. 51, p. 116 ff.

cally different form of Old Indian (*l* instead of *r* etc.)[1] who in the later Vedic period lived in the 'East' (Magadha etc.)[2] were the descendants of the earliest immigrants who left the North-West under the pressure of those Aryans who came after them to settle that region. Attention was on the other hand also drawn to points of agreement with ancient Iranian. Thus in order to provide us with an explanation of *dvár-* "door" beside Gr. θύρα, etc. (I.E. *dh*), the possibility of the existence of one or more dialects in which aspirates lost their second component[3] was taken into consideration.

An important point in the discussions of these problems has long been the occurrence, in the Veda, of forms which admit of the characterization 'Middle Indo-Aryan'. The relevant facts, as far as the R̥gveda is concerned, are few in number and in part uncertain[4] and it is true that in cases such as *vikaṭa-* "of unusual, horrible size or aspect" < *vikr̥ta-* "altered, transformed"; *jyótis-* "light" (*jy* instead of *dy*), a Middle Indian etymology or explanation can be easily established. Still, in their entirety these forms can even in the R̥gveda only, or best, be explained as stated above. Some scholars, among them Renou,[5] have been very reluctant to admit the force of the arguments adduced, but it would seem to me that the occurrence of phonological peculiarities or vulgar pronunciation habits which, while being contemporaneous with the composition or collection of the R̥gveda, anticipate the Prākrit stage of evolution is not beyond probability. The existence of phonological Proto-Middle-Indian forms in those Vedic texts which are later than the R̥gveda was pointed out by many authors,[6] some of them even speaking of a red thread running through Vedic tradition, viz. shifts suggesting, by their resemblance to the phonetics of later Middle Indian dialects, possible dialectic influence from popular

---

[1] See chapter II, p. 42 and compare Reichelt, o.c., p. 242.

[2] Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. XXI and Renou, Introduction générale, p. 58, n. 118 ff.; Reichelt, o.c., p. 246.

[3] Tedesco, in J.A.O.S. 67, p. 88; see also J. Hertel, in I.F. 41, p. 204 who surmises a typically Iranian 'isogloss' spreading over Indian territory.

[4] No serious doubt seems to have been expressed about the identity of *múhur* "at once" and *muhūrtá-* "a moment" on the one hand (*u* as M.I. for *r̥*) and Av. *mərəzu-* "short" on the other (J. Bloch, in Donum natalicium-Schrijnen, Nijmegen-Utrecht 1929, p. 369; cf. Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, II, p. 661 f.).

[5] Renou, Histoire de la langue sanskrite, p. 30, n. 1 declaring his adhesion to the dissentient view of Mansion, Esquisse, p. 129 ff.

[6] Benfey, in G.G.A. 1846, p. 754 and the same in K.Z. 8, p. 11 and elsewhere; v. Bradke, in Z.D.M.G. 40, p. 668 ff.; Bartholomae, in I.F. 3, p. 168; Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. XVIII ff.; F. Edgerton, in Studies in honour of H. Collitz, Baltimore 1930, p. 25 ff.; M. Bloomfield and F. Edgerton, Vedic variants, II, Philadelphia 1932, p. 20 ff.; J. Bloch, in M.S.L. 23, p. 177 ff.; B. K. Ghosh, in I.L. 9, p. 30; Emeneau, o.c., p. 129 ff. and see Renou, Introduction générale, p. 54 f., n. 80.

speech.[1] Although part of the material collected is open to doubt, the existence of dialects, contemporary with at least later Vedic texts, that exhibited (phonological) features known from Middle Indian dialects[2] may be regarded as an incontestable fact.

The problem as to whether old (Indo-Iranian or even Indo-European) forms can be recovered from Middle or New Indian languages which are not represented in the Old Indo-Aryan documentary record cannot detain us,[3] although of course anyone studying the Veda from the linguistic point of view must be interested in knowing whether our texts are representative of all or only (a small) part of the Indo-European speakers who penetrated the North-West of India. For lack of information no definite answer can be given; but there exist unmistakable relations between pre- and post-Vedic stages which are not found in our Vedic records. A clear instance is M. I. A. *idha* "here" (O. Pers. *idā*, Gr. ἰθα-γενής "born here, i.e. in lawful wedlock") as against Vedic and Sanskrit *iha*, but most items adduced[4] cannot be unreservedly accepted. The view of the Dardic and Kafir languages expressed by Grierson[5] and others—"they seem to have left the parent stem after the Indo-Aryan languages, but before all the typical Iranian characteristics had become developed"—was justly corrected by Morgenstierne:[6] the Dardic group is Indo-Aryan, but the Kafir languages, occupying some sort of special position and exhibiting remarkable archaisms, probably contain a residuum which goes back to the language of tribes "which split off from the main body of the Aryans so as to penetrate into the Indian borderland before the invasion of the Indo-Aryans".

The possibility of Vedic 'survivals' in living languages cannot be denied. Yet some scholars will hesitate to accept without reserve the hypothesis[7] about the identity of the Vedic word *śvātrá-* translated as "strengthening, invigorating (of soma etc.)", and forms such as *išpār* in modern Hindukush languages, where it is a name of the rhubarb plant. The assumption of Middle Indo-Aryan survivals of an ancient dialect which had retained even pre-Vedic nominal endings[8] was deservedly refused assent.

---

[1] Bloomfield-Edgerton, o.c., II, p. 20.

[2] For some remarks on the clear evidence in Pāṇini see Emeneau, o.c., p. 129.

[3] I refer to M. Mayrhofer, in Festschrift-W. Kirfel, Bonn 1955, p. 219 ff., and Emeneau, o.c., p. 132 ff.

[4] e.g. by Bloch, L'Indo-Aryen, p. 14 f.; Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 45 ff.

[5] G. A. Grierson, The Piśāca language of North-western India, London 1906, p. III.

[6] G. Morgenstierne in various publications enumerated by Emeneau, o.c., p. 137, n. 37.

[7] G. Morgenstierne, in Sarūpa-Bhāratī, Memorial Volume-L. Sarup, Hoshiarpur 1954, p. 30 ff. Compare also W. Schulze, in Sitzungsberichte Preussische Akad. Berlin 1916, 2 (= Kleine Schriften, Göttingen 1933, p. 224 ff.).—For survivals in classical Sanskrit see Renou, in J.A. 231, p. 321 ff.

[8] V. Henry, in M.S.L. 13, p. 149 f.

Although of little consequence for the study of the language of the Veda in itself, passing mention should be made of the widening of our horizon of the pre-historic migrations or presence of Aryans—or at least of the influence exerted by them—and of the spread of a dialect or language which in any case was closely related to Vedic. I mean the gradual discovering (mainly since 1907) of names of gods (e.g., Mitra and Varuṇa) and persons, and of appellative nouns dating from about XVIIth-XIVth cent. B. C. in the ancient Near East (East Anatolia, North Mesopotamia, etc.), some of which had already attracted attention as early as 1892.[1] There we find some numerals, among them *aika-* "one" with the typically Indian *-ka-* (as against Latin *ūnus* <*oi-no-s*, etc.) and *ai* (out of which the historical Indian *e* is hypothetically assumed to have developed); forms possibly manifesting a still more pronounced preference for *r* (instead of *l*) than Vedic: *parita-* "grey" (Ved. *palita-*)[2]; royal names—not always of certain interpretation— such as *Subandu* (Ved. *Subandhu*), *Aruna* (Ved. *Aruṇa*), *Indaruta* (Ved. *Indraūta, Indrota*). The much debated, but not yet settled, problems of the exact relation of these forms to the ancient Indo-Iranian branch of Indo-European[3] and of the historical events determining their occurrence[4] in the Near East do not detain us. Nor will it be part of our present task to review the various and in part very disputable theories advanced in connection with the prehistoric migrations of the Aryans in general and their relevance to their language, to discussions of geographic names outside, or in the borderlands of, India,[5] or to the, untenable, assumption of an Indian 'fatherland' in the South of Russia.[6] At an early date, it was observed[7] that the similarity of many features in the Vedic grammar to corresponding elements of the ancient Iranian languages should not unduly tempt us to reduce the chronological distance between Veda and the inscriptions of the Achaemenids, and a theory

---

[1] M. Mayrhofer, Die Indo-Arier im Alten Vorderasien (mit einer analytischen Bibliographie), Wiesbaden 1966; the same, in I.F. 70, p. 146 ff.; H. Kronasser, in W.Z.K.M. 53 (1957), p. 181 ff.; R. Hauschild, Ueber die frühesten Arier im Alten Orient, Akad. Leipzig 1962 (a simplified and superficial survey, not devoid of misconceptions and unfounded contentions about prehistoric migrations of the Aryans etc.). For a brief survey also: S. K. Chatterji, Indo-Aryans and Hindi, Calcutta ²1960, p. 15 ff.

[2] Mayrhofer, in I.L. 18, p. 33 f.

[3] There seem to be no coercive reasons for the asssumption of "a third and independent member of the Indo-Iranian family" (Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 30). According to A. Kammenhuber, Die Arier im Vorderen Orient, Heidelberg 1968 (see e.g. p. 234) we have to do with "an (the) Indian dialect of the undivided Indo-Iranian".

[4] See also W. P. Schmid, in I.F. 64, p. 291 ff. and 70, p. 213 ff.

[5] For the names of the Wolga and the Caucasus see e.g. Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, I, 1, p. 87 (following Kretschmer's speculations); but compare the critical remarks by W. P. Schmid, in I.F. 64, p. 291 ff.

[6] Kretschmer, in K.Z. 55, p. 75 ff. (p. 97).

[7] v. Bradke, in Z.D.M.G. 40, p. 669.

advanced to show that at least the later parts of the Ṛgveda are contemporaneous with Zarathustra (VIth cent. B. C.?)[1] was, intelligibly enough, far from having general approval. It appears that no evidence whatever can be produced in favour of the supposition that certain parts of the Ṛgveda were composed in Iran or in the Indo-Iranian borderland.[2]

---

[1] J. Hertel, Die Zeit Zoroasters, Leipzig 1924. For a more reasonable view see Bh. Ghosh, in I.L. 9, p. 48.

[2] as was regarded as possible by Bloch, L'Indo-aryen, p. 2; see also the unfounded opinions ventured by E. Forrer, in Sitzungsberichte Akad. Berlin 1919, p. 1029 ff. (p. 1036).

CHAPTER TWO

PHONOLOGY

The Sanskrit alphabet is usually said to be phonemic in character, but there are some departures of this principle: although six nasals are written (*ṅ, ñ, ṇ, n, m, ṃ*), there are only five nasal phonemes, the *ñ* being an allophone of the dental.[1] Questions of pronunciation continued to arrest attention: the relevant indigenous sources (grammarians, treatises on pronunciation: prātiśākhyas, orthographic peculiarities, etc.[2]) as well as the data furnished by loan-words—e.g., in Greek words borrowed by the Indians or vice versa—were carefully studied[3] and in the course of the present century supplemented by mechanical recordings of Veda recitation. In spite of cases of undeniable variability in ancient times[4]—which, it is true, may account for some remarkable peculiarities in the traditional pronunciation[5]—this recitation appears to be strikingly uniform.[6] I am rather sceptical about a doctrine enunciated to elucidate Vedic intonation,[7] the more so as no regard was paid to the Indian tradition and the explanations proposed for definite phenomena pertaining to a reinforcement of the initial sound of a word (e.g. the loss of an originally obligatory augment) were incompatible with well-established grammatical doctrines. The traditional orthography of the saṃhitās was on the other hand fixed at a late date and, as shown by metric peculiarities, misrepresents in several points the pronunciation of the poets themselves.

A passing reference may also be made to some successful attempts to utilize the progress made in some other provinces of general linguistics. The frequent perfect *jabhāra* was recognized as a case of blend ('contamination') of *ba-bhāra : bhṛ-* "to bear, carry" and *jahāra : hṛ-* "to take, car-

---

[1] M. B. Emeneau, in Language, 22 (1946), p. 86 ff.; T. Elizarenkova, in Studies-F. B. J. Kuiper, The Hague 1968, p. 299 ff.

[2] Siddheshwar Varma, Critical studies in the phonetic observations of Indian grammarians, London 1929; W. S. Allen, Phonetics in ancient India, Oxford 1953; M. Walleser, Zur Aussprache von Skt. *a*, in Z.I.I. 5, p. 193 ff.

[3] I refer to Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. 1 ff.; Debrunner, Nachträge, I, p. 1 ff.; Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 11 ff.

[4] For *ṛ : ri* see Debrunner, o.c., I, p. 19. The Kashmir tradition of the Ṛgveda acquaints us with some interesting differences in the orthography which point, or may point, to differences in the language itself (I. Scheftelowitz, in W.Z.K.M. 21, p. 85 ff.).

[5] See e.g. K. R. Pisharoti, in Bharatiya Vidya, 5 (Bombay 1945), p. 55 ff.

[6] J. Kirste, in Wiener Sitzungsber. 160 (1909), I; J. F. Staal, Nambudiri Veda recitation, The Hague 1961 (with some references).

[7] E. Sievers, in I.F. 42, 193 ff.; 43, p. 1 ff.; p. 129 ff.

ry"[1] and must be viewed in the light of the decided preference for *adhi-hṛ-* "to procure" and *abhi-hṛ-* "to bring, offer" where *-bhṛ-* might have been used.[2] The insight into phenomena such as metathesis (e.g., *jírvi-* : *jívri-* "decrepit"),[3] epenthesis,[4] assimilation, and dissimilation was deepened with the unavoidable result that some questions turned out to be more complex than scholars two generations ago were prepared to suppose: a case in point is *píbati* "he drinks" : *pā-* "to drink" which formerly was held to have *p* for *b* or *b* for *p*, but nowadays is considered a vexed problem.[5] Attention was also drawn to cases or possibilities of haplology (*vaiṣ-ṇāvaruṇa-* "belonging to Viṣṇu and Varuṇa" instead of *vaiṣṇavavāruṇa-*)[6] or of dissimilation of whole words ('kontaktdissimilatorischer Schwund' or 'Satzhaplologie')[7]; to individual forms covered by Grassmann's rule,[8] to irregular omissions and intrusions of sounds,[9] etc.

Proceeding from the admirable results of the analytical, but necessarily non-comparative, phonological and morphological descriptions of the ancient Indian grammarians, European scholars were, from the very beginnings, able to gain an insight into the Vedic sound system and the important phenomenon of vowel gradation (or alternation: 'Ablaut').[10] However, in the course of the XIXth century the traditional doctrine proved untenable in two respects. Especially after the so-called sonant theory had been proposed for Indo-European[11]—stating that certain sounds could function both as consonants and as vowels—, it became clear that Old Indian *a* had in a considerable number of cases arisen from *ṇ*—here the Indians had taught the disappearance of the consonant *n* which occurs in the corresponding strong forms: *rāj-an-i* (sing. loc.) "king" : *rāj-a-su* (plur. loc.)—the three vowel system of Old Indian

---

[1] Debrunner, Nachträge, I, p. 139.

[2] A. Minard, Trois énigmes sur les Cent chemins, I, Paris 1949, p. 152.

[3] Debrunner, o.c., I, p. 154 f.

[4] Cf. also Narten, Sigmatische Aoriste, p. 95.

[5] Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, II, p. 287; Debrunner, o.c., I, p. 63.

[6] Gonda, in Studies-F. B. J. Kuiper, p. 223; M. Leumann, ibidem, p. 53 ff.; G. Cardona, On haplology in Indo-European, Philadelphia 1968 (a somewhat speculative discussion of complications: haplologized forms buttressed by definite homophonous suffixes).

[7] Gonda, in A.O. 21, p. 267 ff.; Debrunner, o.c., I, p. 163.

[8] Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, I, 1, p. 294 ff.

[9] Debrunner, o.c., I, p. 159 f.

[10] Since a discussion of many points of phonological interest cannot be kept separate from the Indo-European background, only some of those problems will be selected here which, while being of special grammatical or interpretative interest, have continued to attract the attention of scholars in the last four decades. For the history of research before 1929 see Wüst, Indisch, p. 77 ff.

[11] K. Brugmann, in G. Curtius, Studien, 9, p. 361 ff.; H. Osthoff, in P.B.B. 3, p. 1 ff. (both articles 1876). One may also read with profit J. Kuryłowicz, Probleme der indogermanischen Lautlehre, in II. Fachtagung für indogermanische und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, Innsbruck 1962, p. 107 ff.

(*a*, *i*, *u*, and *ā*, *ī*, *ū*) could no longer be postulated for the parent language.[1] Old Indian *a* and *ā* must, on the contrary, be derived from I. E. *a*, *e*, *o*, and *ā*, *ē*, *ō*, respectively. In the second place comparative philology came to differ from the Indian grammarians in that it was not the weak grade which was taken as the normal or basic phase in the vowel series *a*, *e* (< *ai*), *ai* (< *āi*); zero, *a*, *ā* etc. but the full grade or *guṇa*, from which the lengthened *(vṛddhi)* and zero grades were claimed to have arisen by processes of strengthening and weakening. Combining the phenomena of vowel gradation, stem gradation and accentuation Benfey[2] has as early as 1852 seen that accented strong forms such as *prāñc-* "directed forwards" were original and weak forms such as *prāc-* the result of a loss of accent.

That is not to say that all details were soon clarified or even studied. For instance, after the theory of the Indo-European long vocalic sonants had been established[3] the occurrence of *ā* beside *ān*, *ām* in the weak grade gave rise to considerable dispute.[4]

Whereas, however, the main conclusions arrived at in the seventies of the preceding century have for many years been generally accepted, one detail, known as Brugmann's rule (I. E. *o* in an open syllable > I. Iran. *ā*),[5] remained controversial[6] far into the present century, even after its author himself had withdrawn his proposal in view of forceful counter arguments.[7] "It is a curious irony of fate that 'Brugmann's law' refers not to one of this eminent master's numerous discoveries which have become the common property of science but to a dogma which was vigorously attacked at the outset".[8] The equations on which this law was based should indeed rather be explained either as cases of an original lengthened grade (e.g., *jānu-* "knee": Gr. γόνυ; some scholars compared Gr. γωνία "corner, angle"; τρίγωνος "triangular"[9]; as products of analogy (*dātáram* (acc. sing.) "the giver": Gr. δώτορα beside the nom. *dātā* < *dōtō(r)-*; compare also the Greek type ἀγών, gen. sing. ἀγῶνος "assembly met to see games etc." which shows an actual advance of the long vowel

---

[1] For a discussion of the difficulties resulting from this theory see also F. de Saussure, in M.S.L. 3 (1877), p. 359 ff. (= Recueil, p. 379 ff.).

[2] Benfey, Grammatik, p. 310.

[3] De Saussure, Mémoire, p. 239 ff.

[4] I refer to Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. 16; Debrunner, Nachträge, I, p. 10.

[5] Brugmann, o.c., 9, p. 363 ff.

[6] It was for instance rejected—and rightly so—by J. Schmidt, in K.Z. 25 (1881), p. 1 ff.; A. Meillet, in M.S.L. 9 (1896), p. 142 ff.; Wüst, Indisch, p. 84 f.; Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, I, 1, p. 220 ff.

[7] Brugmann, in I.F. 32 (1913), p. 191. (Compare also the same in Grundriss[2], I, p. 139).

[8] C. D. Buck, in A.J.P. 17 (1896), p. 445.

[9] See however Debrunner, in I.F. 60, p. 41 f. (another possibility is -γωνος <*γον ϝ-o-ς). The question is still in dispute (see A. Debrunner, in I.F. 60, p. 40 ff.); one should not be too sceptical because of Gr. γωνία.

in all cases); or as result of rhythmic tendencies especially in two morphological classes, viz. the perfect of the type *jajāna* (*jan*- "to generate, be born"): Gr. γέγονα, and the causatives of the type *sādayati* "he causes to sit down" as against Lat. *moneo* "I remind". Whereas Brugmann[1] had maintained that no other satisfactory explanation of these forms had been advanced, Buck,[2] recalling Gr. πέφηνα (perf. of φαίνω "I cause to appear"), Lat. *sēdit* "he has sat down" (O. I. *sasāda*), and perfects with a long vowel beside presents with *a* or *o* (cf., e.g., Lat. *scăbo*, perf. *scābī* "I scratch"), and, regarding the *ā* in the causatives as due to the influence of denominatives—compare also Gr. τρωπάω "I turn (frequently)": τρέπω "I turn"—, showed that these categories can be explained without our having recourse to the 'law' under discussion. Rather than the possibility of differences in intonation,[3] it is the fact that in prehistoric times the development *o* > *a* preceded that of *e* > *a*—the possibility of a common change with Slavonic deserves to be considered—which seems to have been an important factor in this process:[4] a pair like nom. sing. **dōtō(r)*: acc. **dōtorm̥* "giver" (Gr. δώτωρ: δώτορα), after developing into **dōtō(r)*: **dōtarm̥*, became, by way of analogous levelling, **dōtō(r)*: **dōtōrm̥* because there was no other possibility; hence O.I. *dātā́ : dātā́ram*. The differences between the Indo-European and the Indo-Iranian systems of vowel alternation led on the other hand to the introduction of forms such as (I. Ir. and) Vedic *sādáyati* "he causes to sit" (root *sad*-) beside I. I. **raučayati* "he causes to shine" (root *ruč*-) > Ved. *rocáyati* (*a + a* > *ā*, *a + u* > I. Ir. *au* > Ved. *o*) whereas I. E. had **sodéi̯eti* and **loukéi̯eti*.[5]

Likewise in contradistinction to its sister languages, where the phenomenon is scarce and incidental,[6] Old-Indian especially after the period of the Ṛgveda, systematically availed itself of the possibilities furnished by the co-existence of a normal and a lengthened grade: in cases such as *bhū̆mi*- "earth": *bhaumá*- "relating to the earth", the lengthened grade has—as a rule in combination with a shift of accent— become functional: compare, e.g., *strī́*- "woman": *straiṇa*- "female"; *tridhā́tu*- "threefold": *traidhātaví*- "name of a ceremony".[7] In the course of time, in order to

---

[1] Brugmann, Grundriss (1st ed.), II, p. 1146; 1205 f.
[2] Buck, l.c. See also chapter IV, p. 102.
[3] Sievers, in Festschrift-W. Braune, Dortmund 1920, p. 156.
[4] M. Mayrhofer, Handbuch des Pāli, Heidelberg 1951, I, p. 35 ff.
[5] J. Kuryłowicz, in M.S.L. 45, p. 57 ff. Recent attempts to support Brugmann's argument may be omitted.
[6] For particulars see Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, II, 2, p. 103 ff. In Old-Iranian this type of derivation is on the increase. Incorrectly: Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 198 f.
[7] N. Stchoupak, in M.S.L. 21, p. 27 makes some remarks on the meaning of derivatives of this type.

elucidate this important and most productive development attention was drawn to the greater intensity of initial syllables in Latin and German[1] (where however the accentuation was quite different); to the alleged existence of monosyllables with vṛddhi and a collective meaning (*vā́c-* "speech": *vácas-* "word");[2] to originally expressive and rhythmic lengthening.[3] Most probably, however, its origin must be sought in definite examples in which the vṛddhi was characteristic of the paradigm of the word which was at the base of the derivative (nominatives of monosyllables[4])[5].

The 'reconstruction' of an I. E. schwa (based on the correspondence of O. Ind. *i* with Lat. *a* etc. $\langle$ I. E. *ə* : *pitár-* "father": Lat. *pater*) proposed by Fick[6] and others, proved, notwithstanding some abortive attempts at demonstrating its incorrectness[7] or at proving the *i* to be suffixal wherever it appears,[8] substantially justified and indispensable. This is not to say that it did not leave prolonged discussions on some details. The assumption of a development I. E. *ə* $>$ O. I. *a*[9] was rightly rejected, etymological explanations such as *rátna-* ($\langle$ **rə-tno-*[10]) "wealth": *rātí-* "gift" being questionable. Relations such as that between *dhe-nú-* "milch-cow" ($\langle$ **dhē[i]-nú-*), *dhā́y-as-* "nourishing" and *dháy-a-ti* "he sucks" ($\langle$ **dhə-i̯é-ti?*) continued, on the other hand, to tempt the ingenuity of comparatists. Most suppositions are untenable: change of *ə $>$ *a* before *i̯* beginning an open syllable;[11] "Zerdehnung, wo anscheinend der Diphthong auf Kontraktion beruht":[12] *déṣṭha-* "giving most" $\langle$ **dā́-iṣṭha-*; *préṣṭha-* "dearest" $\langle$ **práy-iṣṭha-*, etc.;[13] the forms with *e* to be regarded as secondary innovations after *dháyati*;[14]

---

[1] Cf. L. Havet, in M.S.L. 6, p. 13 ff.

[2] W. Streitberg, in I.F. 3, p. 380 ff.; but see Bloomfield, in T.A.P.A. 26, p. 5 ff. (esp. p. 9).

[3] E. Schwyzer, Griechische Grammatik, I, München 1939, p. 356.

[4] Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, III, p. 29 f.

[5] M. Leumann, in I.F. 61, p. 1 ff.

[6] A. Fick, in B.B. 3 (1879), p. 157 ff.

[7] e.g. H. Pedersen, in K.Z. 36, p. 74 ff.; 38, p. 400.

[8] Burrow, in T.P.S. 1949, p. 22 ff.; the same, Sanskrit language, p. 84 ff.; 104; 108 ff.

[9] F. Bechtel, Die Hauptprobleme der indogermanischen Lautlehre, Göttingen 1892, p. 252.

[10] O. Szemerényi, in K.Z. 73, p. 181 proposes **r[ə]-* + a suffix *-atna-*, *rə-* being the weak grade beside **reH-* $>$ O.I. *rā-* 'to grant'. An original paradigm **reH-i-s / *reə-i̯-és* makes also Vedic *rayí-* "possession, wealth", *revánt-* "opulent" on the one hand and *rāy-*, *rā[y]-* (nom. *rā́-s*, gen. *rāy-ás*) "property" on the other more intelligible.

[11] Chr. Bartholomae, Grundriss der iranischen Philologie, Strassburg 1895-1901, I, 1, p. 28. Cf. also Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, I, 1, p. 269.

[12] Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. 51.

[13] J. Hertel, Die arische Feuerlehre, Leipzig 1925, p. 63 ff.; 78 ff. most improbably disconnects *dhenú-* and *dháyati*. It is however to be noted that in the Ṛgveda *śréṣṭha-* is often trisyllabic representing, in view of Gr. κρείων "lord", a form **śra-iṣṭha-* (B. Ghosh, Linguistic introduction to Sanskrit, Calcutta 1937, p. 34).

[14] Hirt, Indogermanische Grammatik, II, p. 67.

in another explanation: *dhéə-> O. I. dhā-, hence dhātrī- "nurse"; with i̯:
*dhə-i-tó->*dhi-i-tó>O. I. dhītá-, the verbal adjective; and later the stem
*dhēi̯- (> O. I. dhāy-) followed by a consonant was to become *dhĕi̯-,
hence dhenú-, but dháyati was left unmentioned.[1]

A few words must here be said about the significance of the laryngeal
theory[2] for Old Indian phonetics.[3] De Saussure's[4] assumption that a simi-
larity of phonemic variation in morphemes of a seemingly different
structure such as Gr. ἔχω < *σέχ-ω: ἔ-σχ-ον; λείπ-ω: ἔ-λιπ-ον and ἵ-στᾱ-μι:
στᾰ-τό-ς must be conceived as pointing to anterior forms of a similar
structure led him to a uniform theory of the Indo-European ablaut. The
original long vowels (to be distinguished from those long by vṛddhi)
resulted from a combination of e with several consonants which were no
longer found in the historical periods and were afterwards called laryn-
geals (H): *dhē- "to place"; *stā- "to stand"; *dō- "to give" are re-
spectively derived from *dheH₁, *steH₂, *deH₃.[5] When preceding the
vowel e these three laryngeals caused this vowel to assume the colour
e, a, o, respectively: *es- "to be" < *H₁es-; *anti "in front" < *H₂enti;
*osti- "bone" < *H₃esti-. Until 1927, this theory was accepted by only a
few scholars; however, after reflexes of laryngeals were pointed out in
Hittite[6] the theory began to win favour.

Since the difference in vowel quality has ceased to exist in Old Indian
the (disputed) question as to the number of laryngeals is for our purposes
of little consequence. In other respects, however, the theory may contrib-
ute to a more satisfactory understanding of a variety of phenomena.[7]

---

[1] Benveniste, Origines, p. 169. A simple solution would be *dhēi̯- (in dháy-as- "nourish-
ing") > dhĕi̯- (long diphthong > short diphthong).

[2] It should be borne in mind that many fundamental questions pertaining to this theo-
ry are still controversial.

[3] For a brief survey see e.g. W. P. Lehmann, Proto-Indo-European phonology, Austin
1952, p. 22 ff.; E. Polomé, Zum heutigen Stand der Laryngaltheorie, in Revue belge de
philologie et d'histoire, 30 (1952), p. 444 ff.; Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 84 ff.; W. Win-
ter (editor), Evidence for laryngeals, Univ. of Texas 1960 and the review of this book by
B. Panzer, in Linguistics 50 (1969), p. 86 ff.; J. Puhvel, Laryngeals and the I.E. verb,
Berkeley 1960; F. O. Lindeman, Einführung in die Laryngaltheorie, Berlin 1970 (see esp.
p. 43; 45 f.; 57; 63; 66 f.; 77; 78; 79 f.; 81; 82; 89, also on points of Vedic interest which I
left unmentioned).

[4] De Saussure, Mémoire, p. 146.

[5] Curiously enough the implication that Original Indo-European has had only one vow-
el—in which it would be unique (see also N. S. Trubetzkoy, Grundzüge der Phonologie,
Prague 1939, p. 86)—does not seem to have worried De Saussure and most advocates of
his theory very much.

[6] J. Kuryłowicz, in Symbolae grammaticae—J. Rozwadowski, 1 (Krakow 1927), p. 95 ff.;
the same, in Prace filologiczne 11 (1927), p. 201 ff.; W. Couvreur, De Hettitische ḫ, Louvain
1935.

[7] A useful survey may be found in F. B. J. Kuiper, Traces of laryngeals in Vedic Sanskrit,
in India antiqua, a volume of Oriental studies presented to J. Ph. Vogel, Leyden 1947, p.
198 ff.; for loss of a laryngeal in "internal sandhi" the same, in Die Sprache, 7, p. 14 ff.; for a

Forms such as *tir-á-ti* "to pass over" (compare also *tirás* "across") beside *tár-a-ti* were formerly explained by assuming a vocalic *r* (*r̥*) followed by a corresponding transitional consonant *(r)* in the weak form of the root (**tr̥r-é-ti*, usually written **tr̥ʳ-é-ti*). The question has to be asked why a (consonantal) *r* is not found, as to be expected, between consonant and vowel, rather than *r̥* (compare also the etymologically related *tráyate* "he protects"). It appears that *tiráti* should rather be interpreted as continuing **tr̥H-é-ti* in which the *r̥* occupied an interconsonantal position so as to appear as a vowel (**r̥* > O. I. *ir*). Alternations such as *tīrṇá-* (the verbal adjective) and *tiráti*, or as *śīrṣán-* "head" beside the synonymous *śíras-* are explicable on the understanding that **tr̥Hnó-* and **k̂r̥Hsén-* on the one hand and **tr̥Héti* and **k̂r̥Hes-* on the other developed differently, *r̥H* before a consonant appearing as *īr* (when preceded by a labial, as *ūr*[1]) in Old Indian, and an intermediate stage between *r̥H* and *īr, ūr* being the *r̥̄* postulated long ago (the reduced low-tone form represented as *īr* before consonants and as *ir* before vowels[2]). Whereas *nī-tá-* "guided, led" beside the present *náy-ati* and the noun *né-tar-* "the one who leds" was often held to derive from the two-syllabic base **nei̯-āˣ*——the weakest form of which is **ni̯ə-* > **nī-*[3]—to be postulated beside **nei̯-* (> O. I. *nay-* and *ne-*), the laryngeal theory states this alternation as follows: the combinations *iH, uH* resulted in *ī, ū* while after the corresponding diphthongs *(eiH, euH)* the *H* disappeared without trace.[4] If however the traditional *ə* is identified with many, though not all,[5] comparatists with a vocalic version of the *H (Ḥ)*, both explanations are substantially identical.[6]

Some curious instances of alternation between *a* and *i*, formerly described as cases of "Vokalschwächung"[7] or analogy,[8] can be explained if we assume the effect of what has been called laryngeal umlaut[9] on a reduced grade vowel of a preceding syllable, e.g., I. E. **k̂eₘH-* > O. I.

---

bibliographical note see Debrunner, Nachträge, I, p. 46 f.; 57.

[1] M. Bloomfield, in B.B. 23, p. 108.

[2] Since De Saussure, Mémoire, p. 239 ff.

[3] I cannot enter here into a discussion of the laryngealist controversy as to whether the Orig. I.E. phonological system comprised the long vowels **ī* etc. or instead of these **iH* etc. How to judge a sing. instr. in -*ī* (e.g. *śámī-* "effort") in pausa (an uncontracted *iH* as a sandhi variant?), if the stem (*śámī-*) contains *i* < **iH*?

[4] Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 109.

[5] Burrow, o.c., p. 88 is among those who reject this hypothesis.

[6] American scholars—see E. H. Sturtevant, The Indo-Hittite laryngeals, Baltimore 1942—, while keeping the old system intact and fitting it into their version of the laryngeal theory erroneously supposed the laryngeals to have existed in a Indo-Hittite, pre-Indo-European period, but to have vanished in Indo-European proper.

[7] Grassmann, Wörterbuch, 1394 s.v. *śimī-*.

[8] Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. 18.

[9] Kuiper, in A.O. 20 (1946), p. 23 ff.

śim-: **ḱémH₂-⟩ O. I. *śam-* in *śámī-* "effort" but ṚV. 1, 151, 1 *śímī-*.

The curious increase of the number of voiceless aspirates,[1] which appear only in Indo-Iranian with any frequency—initial *th*, rare in later texts, does not however occur in the Ṛgveda—have intrigued many scholars.[2] Correspondences such as O. I. *sthā-* "to stand": Gr. ἵστημι (ἵστᾱμι), Lat. *stāre; rátha-* "chariot": Lat. *rota; pṛthú-* "broad": Gr. πλατύς gave rise to divergent views, some scholars regarding the aspirates as secondary developments, others maintaining that these sounds belonged to the parent language[3] or avowing their ignorance.[4] Untenable suggestions[5] can be omitted here. Nowadays the prevailing opinion is that the voiceless aspirates are largely an innovation of Indo-Iranian, the origin of which can generally speaking be attributed to a combination of I. E. *H* with a preceding unaspirated voiceless consonant and ensuing processes of levelling by way of analogy.[6] Thus the paradigm *pánthās* (nom. sing.) "road", gen. sing. *pathás*, which is etymologically related to Gr. πόντος "sea", Lat. *pons* (stem *pont-*) "bridge", is explained as continuing I. E. **pónteH-s: *pṇtH-ós*, the *th* being introduced from the weak cases into the strong where it is absent in Old Iranian: Av. *pantā̊* (nom.): *paθō* (gen.).[7] It may be recalled that De Saussure[8] had already assumed a development **pḷtə-ú-* ⟩ O. I. *pṛthú-* and **stā-* "to stand" ⟩ O. I. *sthā-* in the present *tiṣṭhati* where ə preceded the thematic vowel (⟨ **(s)ti-stə-e-ti*). This development entailed the appearance of voiceless aspirates in combinations of *p*, *t*, *k* at the end of a root and a suffix or ending beginning with a sonant aspirate: *kdh* ⟩ *kth*.

The co-existence of *t* and *th* was utilized for the purpose of semantic

---

[1] J. Zubatý, in K.Z. 31 (1892), p. 1 ff.

[2] See also Wüst, Indisch, p. 95; Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, I, 1, p. 279.

[3] I refer to Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. 119; 122, who (p. 121) speaks of a transition of voiceless aspirates to *k*, *t*, *p* in most sister languages. Compare also Meillet, Les dialectes indo-européennes, Paris 1950, p. 78 ff.

[4] Brugmann, Grundriss, I, p. 633.

[5] e.g. H. Petersson, Studien über die indogermanische Heteroklisie, Lund 1921, p. 251 (Wurzelerweiterung); Hirt, Indogerm. Grammatik, I, p. 246; P. Kretschmer, in K.Z. 55, p. 98 (influence of languages spoken in Asia Minor).

[6] E. H. Sturtevant failed to prove that three different laryngeals had converted a preceding *t* etc. into *th* etc. in Orig. Indo-European. His proposal (o.c., § 78a) to solve the difficulty presented by the superlatives in *-iṣṭha-* (as against Gr. -ιστο-) beside which there is no trace of a *H* comparable to the α in Gr. ἵσταται is far from convincing: the feminine abstract nouns postulated by him as bases of these adjectives are found nowhere; on the contrary, the abstract beside Gr. ἄριστος is not **ἄριστα but ἀρετή. Neither form nor function of the superlatives force us, moreover, to try this way.

[7] Kuryłowicz, Etudes indo-européennes, Krakow 1935, p. 46 ff.; the same, L'apophonie en indo-européen, Wrocław 1956, p. 377. See e.g. also Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, II, p. 363.

[8] De Saussure, in B.S.L. 1891, p. CXVIII (cf. Recueil, p. 603). See also Meillet, in M.S.L. 10, p. 276.

differentiation:[1] *uktá-* "said" (with an original suffix *-tó-*): *ukthá-* "saying, a kind of recitation" (with a younger suffix), with the result that *-tha-* came to play an important part in the Old Indian morphology. Similar differentiations may be assumed to have developed in the dual of the verb, the 3rd person remaining *bhár-a-tas*, the 2nd becoming *bhár-a-thas*. The *-tha-* in the ordinals (*caturthá-* "the fourth", etc.[2]) is therefore neither[3] inherited from Indo-European, nor an expressive variant[4] but rather the result of a younger differentiation[5] which spread in this non-deverbative group.[6]

There are other traces of *H* in cases where it was immediately preceded by an occlusive. Thus the Vedic *máh-*, *mahá-*, *máhas-*, *mahá-*, etc. "great-(ness), etc." may continue an I. E. root $*me\hat{g}\text{-}H\text{-}$; whereas in Greek the *H* disappeared without a trace, it seems to have extended to the whole Old Indian declension from those forms in which it occurred before a vowel (e.g., gen. sing. $*me\hat{g}H\text{-}és$) where it is supposed to have caused the aspiration ($> *me\hat{g}hés > $ O. I. *mahás*).[7]

Not all hypotheses concerning laryngeals are however equally felicitous.[8] Occasional exceptions and the non-occurrence of forms which might be expected sometimes detract from their probability. Especially when alternative 'traditional' explications based on for instance, analogy, are less complicated, the assumption of a prehistoric sound otherwise no longer traceable is not always convincing. The origin of perfects of the type *uvāca* (*vac-* "to speak"), for instance, may be understood[9] without ignoring the existence of *vavāca*, and without being under the necessity of proving that at least a considerable number of the roots showing this type of reduplication originally had an initial laryngeal; of assuming for O. I. *vad-* "to speak" a regular perfect stem $*Hu\text{-}H\d{u}od\text{-}$ or $*Hu\text{-}Ho\d{u}d\text{-}$; of choosing the second of these forms as the one which could develop into

---

[1] Thieme, Fremdling, p. 65 too theoretically distinguishes, in three cases, a general and abstract *-tá-* and a particular and concrete *-thá-*.

[2] Not, with Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 195 < *caturtā* < *caturtaH "fourness, group of four". A similar untenable opinion was pronounced in connection with the superlatives in *-iṣṭha-* (e.g. *vániṣṭha-* "gaining most") by Sturtevant, The Indo-Hittite laryngeals, § 78a (thematic adjectives built on ancient feminine abstracts or collectives in *-tā* < $*teH_2$).

[3] As is said in Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, II, 2, p. 720.

[4] Meillet, in Symb. gramm. Rozwadowski, I, p. 107.

[5] Cf. Benveniste, Noms d'agent et noms d'action en indo-européen, Paris 1948, p. 164.

[6] For *th* in I.E. suffixes in general: Hj. Frisk, Suffixales *-th-* im Indogermanischen, Göteborg 1936.

[7] Compare also Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, II, p. 550 s.v. *majmán-*.

[8] There are indeed serious reasons for rejecting (with Kuryłowicz, Apophonie, p. 169) the laryngeal theory with regard to the later stages of the individual Indo-European languages, because such attempts would be "aptes à discréditer la théorie".

[9] See p. 102.

uvād-; and of considering it "only of secondary importance whether we assume a dissimilatory loss of the *uu̯* and later development I. E. **o* > Skt. *ā* or whether we prefer to regard the *ā* as resulting from a shortening of the long diphthong **āu̯*".[1]

The consistent advocates of the laryngeal theory think it preferable to traditional explications also because it enables them to reduce the number of types or categories belonging to the same formation. It has for instance been suggested[2] that the 7th, 5th and 9th present classes[3] should be explained as perfectly parallel formations: O. I. *riṇákti* "he leaves, empties" (7th class) < I. E. **li-né-ku̯-ti; śṛṇóti* "he hears" (5th class) < I. E. **k̂l̥-né-u̯-ti; punāti* "he cleanses, purifies" (9th class) < **pu-né-H-ti*. While in so doing they return to the ancient Indian theory of an infix *n* + a vowel (-*no-/-nu-* in the 5th class etc.), the advantages and disadvantages of which can indeed be discussed, they neglect to verify the assumption of strong forms of the type **li-né-ku̯-ti* for the parent language.[4] The advantage claimed for this hypothesis—strictly parallel roots consisting of three sounds[5] each: *liku̯-, k̂l̥u̯-, puH*—was however also characteristic of the "traditional" explanation, if we realize that **pū-* represents **puə-* (the forms of the 9th class being analysable as **pu-n-ə́-ti : *pu-n-ə-més*). Nor is the laryngeal theory needed to understand forms such as *anánti* "they breathe" (< **an[ə]-énti*),[6] because there is never trace of *ə* before a vowel. This absence of *ə* enables us also to explain the paradigms *dhī́-s* "vision": gen. sing. *dhiy-ás; bhū́-s* "world": *bhuv-ás*; the nominatives presuppose **dhiə-, bhu-ə*; the *y* and *v* in the genitives are transitional sounds pronounced after the disappearance of *ə*.[7]

There is no generally accepted theory to account for the variation known as the mobile *s* which affects all Indo-European languages,[8] some scholars[9] being inclined to regard it as due to loss of initial *s* in sandhi (after consonantal auslaut), others[10] supposing it to be the remnant of a preformative element the meaning of which had become obscured. A disadvantage of the latter hypothesis is the almost complete absence of

---

[1] Thus W. Winter, in Language, 26 (1950), p. 365 ff.
[2] H. Hendriksen, Untersuchungen über die Bedeutung des Hethitischen für die Laryngaltheorie, Copenhagen 1941, p. 17.
[3] See chapter IV, p. 83 ff.
[4] See chapter IV, n. 85 f.
[5] Of course Hendriksen, l.c., speaks of "consonants".
[6] Cf. Hendriksen, o.c., p. 16.
[7] Cf. Hendriksen, o.c., p. 16 f. In these cases one should not, with L. Zgusta, in Arch. Or. 19, p. 441, regard the *i* and *ū* as instances of lengthening in monosyllabic words.
[8] J. Schrijnen, Etude sur le phénomène de l'*s* mobile, Thesis Louvain 1891.
[9] e.g. Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 80.
[10] e.g. Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, I, 1, p. 304.

plausible examples of this *s* before the vocalic onset of a word, where one would expect to find it as well, if the *s* represented a prefix. The suggestion[1] that there did exist, in that position, an alternation laryngeal + vowel: *s* + laryngeal + vowel could not however be supported by a sufficient number of reliable etymologies.[2]

Many scholars have taken the trouble to elucidate a complex of phenomena which for convenience may be collectively described as prothesis. Here too it is only the examination of pertinent facts based on sound etymological combinations which will lead us to a satisfactory result.[3] From the succession of hypotheses some may be quoted: the suggestions to analyse *irajyáti* "to arrange, dispose" as **ir-aj-yá-ti*[4] or as a kind of intensive **ir-arj-yá-ti*[5] (cf. perfects of the type *iy-eṣa iṣ-* "to wish"; *uv-oṣa: uṣ-* "to burn"; to regard that *i* or the *u* in *uloká- = loká-* "world" as a genuine prothetic vowel,[6] *ir* as a phonetic variant instead of *r* ⟨ **r̥*, etc. before a vowel,[7] or the *u*, at least in *uloká-*, as a Dravidian pronunciation.[8]

Various incorrect statements were advanced in former days with regard to the so-called spurious diphthongs. They have now been settled by a continued examination of the relevant facts: the perfect *sedimá* "we are seated"[9] cannot be identical with Lat. *sēdimus* because of the Avestan perfect optative *hazdyāṯ*;[10] it has therefore to be explained as ⟨ I.Ir. **sa-zd-imá*, not from I.Ir. **sēd-imá* ⟨ I.E. **se-zd-imé*.

The question of the at first sight curious double development of I. Ir. **az (⟩ e, o)* gave rise to some hypotheses which proved to be unacceptable: it can neither represent a reflex of the original I.E. **es, os* with preservation of the vowel qualities and compensatory lengthening,[11] because al-

---

[1] H. M. Hoenigswald, in Language, 28 (1952), p. 182 ff.

[2] The equation *sanutár* "aside, far from": Gr. ἄνευ "away from, without" is very uncertain; *árṇa-* "wave, flood" has most likely to do with *sarati* "to run, flow"; *āpnoti* "he reaches" nothing with *sapati* "he worships".

[3] F. A. Wood, in A.J.P. 52 (1931), p. 107 fell into every kind of error: the *a* of *ásṛj-* "blood" is not prothetic (Gr. ἔαρ, Hitt. *eshar*) and the word has nothing to do with *sṛjati* "to let go, emit"; the *ā-* in *ārāma-* "place of pleasure" is a prefix; no etymological relation between *ulūpa-* "a species of plant" and Gothic *laufs* "foliage" can be possibly established; the identification of the initial *i* of *ínakṣati* "he strives to obtain" with the root *i-* "to go" is a product of fantasy.

[4] Bartholomae, Arische Forschungen, II, Halle 1886, p. 93 f.

[5] Brugmann, in I.F. 32, p. 58 ff.

[6] e.g. Pischel, Vedische Studien, I, p. 17. For *uloká-* see L. Renou, Etudes de grammaire sanskrite, I, Paris 1936, p. 79 ("*u* adventice"); the same, Grammaire védique, p. 17; 37.

[7] Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 37.

[8] I refer to Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, I, p. 111 f.

[9] J. Schmidt, in K.Z. 25, p. 60 ff.

[10] H. Hübschmann, in K.Z. 26, p. 325.

[11] As was surmised by M. Bloomfield, in A.J.P. 3, p. 25 ff., and F. Edgerton, in Language, 5, p. 266 f.

ready in Indo-Iranian I.E. *e and *o had irrevocably merged in *a, nor be satisfactorily explained by the supposition[1] that I.Ir. *as normally becomes O.I. o, but sometimes is 'unrounded' to develop into e. A preferable solution is based on the consideration that a transition of I.Ir. *as > az is, after the loss of the z, liable to result in a disturbance of the prosodic patterns which may however be avoided by the insertion of a semi-vocalic glide; here both y and v may be expected, the former with a preceding a resulting in e, the latter in o.[2] Thus the transition of *az to e in cases such as edhi "be!" < *az-dhi seems to be due to a certain "i quality" (palatalization) of the *z.[3]

Wackernagel,[4] who after others, among whom was De Saussure,[5] had, in a long and important publication, elucidated various aspects of vowel lengthening under the influence of rhythmic factors,[6] taught[7] that a lengthening of final a, i, u—which is almost exclusively limited to the Vedic saṃhitās—occurs only within a sentence or verse, before a single initial consonant of the following word.[8] The tradition of the texts being very reliable,[9] the fixation of this phenomenon must be considerably older than the texts as we know them. From the point of view of distribution there are remarkable differences. The vocative, verb forms in -i and -u, and some prepositions are, for instance, hardly ever subject to this lengthening.[10] In definite combinations a preference for a long vowel is on the other hand undeniable: śrudhī havam "hear (my) invocation", etc. which may be taken to belong to the traditions of versification; before an enclitic a final vowel is very often long: nū́ cid. Wackernagel indeed added that for purposes of metre and versification the poets availed themselves of these long vowels,[11] which he observed must have existed in the living language. In this he was right: it cannot be maintained that this phenom-

---

[1] Proposed by J. Bloch, in B.S.O.S. 6, p. 291 ff.

[2] W. S. Allen, Sandhi, The Hague 1962, p. 70 f.; 101 ff.

[3] For some complications and possibilities see also V. Pisani, in Rendiconti Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e lettere, 83 (Milan 1950), p. 63 ff.—C. C. Uhlenbeck, Handboek der indische klankleer, Leiden 1894 (A manuel of Sanskrit phonetics, London 1898, § 50), p. 54 f. assumed loss of z after it had produced a y.

[4] Wackernagel, Das Dehnungsgesetz der griechischen Komposita, Programm Basel 1889 (= Kleine Schriften, p. 897 ff.).

[5] De Saussure in Mélanges-Graux, Paris 1887, p. 737 ff. (= Recueil, p. 464 ff.).

[6] For rhythm see Meillet, in M.S.L. 21, p. 193 ff. and B.S.L. 31, p. 1 ff.

[7] Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. 310 ff.

[8] For particulars see J. Zubatý, in W.Z.K.M. 2, p. 53 ff.; 133 ff.; 309 ff.; 3, 86 ff.; 151 ff.; 281 ff.; 4, 1 ff.; 89 ff. (and especially 2, p. 139).

[9] H. Oldenberg, Prolegomena, p. 416.

[10] See also Kuryłowicz, L'apophonie en indo-européen, p. 350 f.

[11] For other cases of variable length of a syllable utilized by the poets see Meillet, Mélanges-J. Vendryes, Paris 1925, p. 281 f.; Kuiper, in India antiqua, p. 204 f.

enon is due to the arbitrariness of the poets as was assumed by Oldenberg.[1]
In believing it to have been inherited in this form from the parent lan-
guage he however went too far. It is moreover clear that the oft repeated
formulation proposed by De Saussure[2] according to which these phenom-
ena were due to a tendency to avoid three successive short syllables is too
vague to account for all details and occurrences. From the rhythmic rule
that roots with final consonants in the perfect add endings beginning with
a consonant directly if the last syllable of the stem is prosodically short,
but with an -i- if that syllable is long (*da-dṛk-ṣé : dṛś-* "to see" but *uvóc-i-
tha : uc-* "to be pleased"), it appears that in definite cases even two pros-
odically short vowels were avoided in successive syllables.

Some scholars made attempts at modifying, supplementing and restat-
ing with greater precision the rule first discovered by Sievers,[3] but often
ignored by the interpreters of the Ṛgveda, that *y* and *v* after a rhythmi-
cally short (light) syllable alternate with (accentless) *iy, uv* after a rhyth-
mically long (heavy) syllable (*ajúryā-* "not subject to decay" but *asūriyá-*
"sunless"). Oldenberg,[4] believing that the cases covered by this rule could
be explained on rhythmic and metrical grounds, pointed out a different
treatment in auslaut where *i, ī, u, ū* are in the oldest parts of the Ṛgveda
retained before an initial vowel of the following word. Edgerton[5] supple-
mented the rule by the important observation that unaccented post-
consonantal and pre-vocalic *iy, uv* (*ṛr*, etc.[6]) appear as *y, v* (*ṛ*, etc.) after a
short (light) syllable—so *y* and *iy* (etc.) are, in his opinion, phonetic variants
of the same phonemes—but remain unaltered if they bear the accent (*íy*,
etc.). This exception did not arise before Indo-European had developed
into Old Indian. The general validity of Edgerton's rule was, however,
justly denied by Kuryłowicz[7] who tried to show that these *y*, etc. have a
double origin.[8] Those *y* and *v* which are inherited from Indo-European
(e.g. *cyávate* "to move from one's place"; *svápna-* "sleep") are never pro-
nounced *iy* and *uv* so that the phenomenon, frequent as it is, is limited

---

[1] Oldenberg, o.c., p. 419.
[2] De Saussure, l.c.
[3] Sievers, in P.B.B. 5 (1878), p. 129 ff.
[4] Oldenberg, Prolegomena, p. 442 and in G.G.N. 1915, p. 529 ff.
[5] F. Edgerton, in Language, 10, p. 235 ff.
[6] For these semi-vowels see Edgerton in Language, 19, p. 83 ff.
[7] Kuryłowicz, Etudes indoeuropéennes, Kraków 1935, p. 256 ff.—For a discussion of the
regular pronunciation *dyávā* "heaven and earth" etc. without reference to the quantity of
the preceding syllable and the possibility of a pronunciation *dívas* etc. where *dyávas* etc. are
handed down see Debrunner and Edgerton in Language, 11, p. 117 ff.
[8] Now see also some additional remarks by W. P. Lehmann in Studies-F. B. J. Kuiper,
The Hague 1968, p. 39 ff. To understand Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 86 f. one should
read Kuryłowicz, o.c., p. 40; 256.

to definite roots and suffixes (for *syắm : siyắm* cf. e.g. Latin *siem*). The occurrences of "initial consonant + *y* or *v*" after an in most cases short syllable find their explanation in the tendency of the Ṛgveda to avoid syllables which are in two ways (natura as well as positione) long.[1] It would however be difficult to give, in questions of this nature, a generally acceptable account of any detail, notwithstanding such obvious tendencies as the avoidance of a sequence **jánimani* (four short syllables) beside *jánmani* (loc. sing.) "birth",[2] which may have contributed much to the spread and distribution of rival suffixes.

As to sandhi let it suffice to say that it has been known for a long time that the rules determined by the indigenous grammarians are far from fully applicable to the Vedic saṃhitās; that the texts as we have them (especially that of the Ṛgveda) do not exactly reflect the original tendencies observed by the poets, that is to say that in their time there was still more latitude in these matters than the written text would have us suppose; that, moreover, the Vedic schools were at liberty to make their choice between two possibilities.[3] Contraction of vowels at the end of a pāda interferes with the metre.[4] The thesis defended by Oldenberg[5] that at the end of a word a vowel could be of any length (from infra-brief to ultra-long) was justly combatted.[6] One might rather suppose the poets to have, from metrical necessity, made it a tradition to utilize definite, unfixed or variable sandhi phenomena of the non-literary language for metrical purposes or to transform them into metrical phenomena. These variations[7] may to a certain extend find their explanation on the basis of the laryngeal theory:[8] long final vowels which have arisen from a combination of a short vowel and *H* seem to have been used before an initial consonant, the short vowel remaining after the loss of *H* which occurred before a vowel (with some restrictions) and in pausa; the ante-consonantal variant in the course of time was generalized. On the other hand it was argued that lengthening due to the contraction of a short vowel at the end of a morpheme or a word with an *H* at the beginning of the following

---

[1] Hence also the pronunciation *śatá-aśva-* 'consisting of a hundred horses' beside *śatắyus-* 'having a hundredfold duration of life'.
[2] Meillet, in M.S.L. 12, p. 219 ff.
[3] Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. 306 ff.; Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 87 ff.; Debrunner, Nachträge, I, p. 174 ff.
[4] Oldenberg, Prolegomena, p. 389; 392.
[5] Oldenberg, in Z.D.M.G. 60, p. 115 ff. and 62, p. 478 ff. (= Kleine Schriften, p. 132 ff. and 287 ff.), and compare E. V. Arnold, in Z.D.M.G. 60, p. 593 ff.
[6] R. Gauthiot, Le fin de mot en indo-européen, Thesis Paris, 1913, p. 165.
[7] for which see in general E. V. Arnold, Vedic metre, Cambridge 1905, ch. IV-VI.
[8] Kuryłowicz, in R.O. 4 (1926-28), p. 196 ff.; Kuiper, Shortening of final vowels in the Rigveda, Amsterdam Acad. 1955.

element was transferred to final syllables.[1] The abhinihita sandhi (the contact of final *e* and *o* with an initial *a* which in classical sandhi is suppressed but in the Vedic saṃhitās is often written and in a still larger number of cases is for metrical reasons to be pronounced[2] posed the question as to the quantity of the final *e* and *o*. In contradistinction to Oldenberg[3] and other authors,[4] who maintained that these final sounds were spoken as *a(y)* and *av* respectively, nowadays some scholars are inclined to think that these sounds were short whatever their colour.[5] Most probably however the development was **ay a* (partially preserved in Vedic) $>$ *e* and **av a* $>$ *o* (written in classical Sanskrit *e* ', *o* '), the reductions *aya* $>$ *e* and *ava* $>$ *o* being well known in Middle Indian.[6]

In spite of the fact that the ancient Indian grammarians had paid much attention to the Vedic accent which they described as musical the first generation of European sanskritists was rather strange to this subject.[7] It was not before 1844 that the antiquity of this accent was understood,[8] and it took several decades gradually to elucidate its character[9] and its importance from the point of view of text interpretation and of comparative grammar, which is apparent, e.g., from the numerous exact correspondences with the Greek accent,[10] and its relevance to important phenomena in other Indo-European languages.[11] Afterwards a number of particular facts and phenomena came to be explained, e.g. the accentuation of nominal compounds,[12] and the accentless words and their normal position

---

[1] Kuryłowicz, in R.O. 4, p. 196 ff.; the same, Apophonie, p. 338 ff.

[2] For some particulars see also M. L. Rastogi, in I.L. 1957, p. 21 ff. (according to the Taittirīyas the initial *a* is eliminated, the other schools speak of absorption of *a* into the preceding *e* or *o*).

[3] Oldenberg, in Z.D.M.G. 44, p. 321 ff. (= Kleine Schriften, p. 617 ff.).

[4] e.g. Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. 324.

[5] Cf. A. M. Ghatage, Traces of short *ĕ* and *ŏ* in the Ṛgveda, A.B.O.R.I. 29 (1948), p. 1 ff.; Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 93.

[6] Allen, Sandhi, p. 39 ff. For 'Prakritic' sandhi in the Ṛgveda: Bh. Ghosh, in I.L. 9, p. 30 ff.—As to final *-au : -āv : -ā*, after the distribution of the variants had been studied by R. Meringer, in K.Z. 28, p. 217 ff., the relevant facts were stated more precisely by F. Sommer, in Festschrift-Streitberg, Heidelberg 1924, p. 253 ff.; from this article it appears that whereas the main treatment of these sounds in the dual ending (*-ā* before a consonant and in pausa; *-āv* before a vowel) are inherited, the partly different facts in other endings require special explanations.

[7] For a short survey see Wüst, Indisch, p. 78 ff.

[8] A. Holtzmann, Ueber den Ablaut, Karlsruhe 1844.

[9] W. D. Whitney, in T.A.P.A. 1869-70, p. 20 ff.; M. Haug, Ueber das Wesen und den Werth des wedischen Accents, München Acad. 1874. Compare J. Kuryłowicz, L'accentuation des langues indo-européennes, Kraków 1952.

[10] F. Bopp, Vergleichendes Accentuationssystem, Berlin 1854; the same, in K.Z. 3, p. 1 ff. For deviations of the Indo-European accentuation: Ch. Bally, in Mélanges-F. de Saussure, Paris 1908, p. 1 ff. and Meillet, in M.S.L. 19, p. 65 ff.

[11] K. Verner, in K.Z. 23, p. 97 ff.

[12] J. N. Reuter, in K.Z. 31, p. 157 ff.; 485 ff.

in the sentence.[1] The insight gained was deepened and some rules were restated more exactly: thus the finite verbs may be said to bear the accent if the clause in which they occur refers to another sentence (i.e., not only in clauses which are, by a conjunction, etc., characterized as subordinate[2]); they are accentless in completely autonomous clauses. Hence also the absence of the accent in the case of a vocative which as an autonomous word interrupts a sentence. Jacobi argued successfully that already in the Vedic period another type of tone was developing, which being expiratory in character became prominent in the living language.[3] These few remarks are not to say that the descriptions of the Vedic accent found in the handbooks are correct. Sometimes facts of notation and of accentuation proper are confused.[4] Especially the independent svarita has given rise to misunderstanding. Whereas, in the system of the Ṛgveda, etc., there is no marking of the accented syllable *(udātta)* but of the following *(svarita)*[5] instead (distinguished in writing by a vertical stroke), there are also cases of *svarita* which are independent of a preceding *udātta*, because that syllable has been suppressed: *kúa* "where" (dissyllabic) in most cases is written *kvá* (not to be transcribed *kvà* which, though usual, would suggest a gravis, but *k̀va*), the syllable being marked as a svarita. It causes confusion to say that here a "separate type of main accent" has "secondarily arisen out of contraction".[6] As to the svarita syllable it is not to be regarded[7] as rising to a higher pitch (although modern reciters are inclined to pronounce it thus), but[8] as beginning at the high pitch of the preceding udātta which then falls in the process of utterance.

Whereas Old Indian stands alone in preserving a class of voiced aspirates which, it is generally assumed, the parent language possessed, it does not preserve all occurrences of them unchanged.[9] In anticipation of their later weakening to *h* in Middle Indo-Aryan *dh* and *bh* in definite positions are

[1] Wackernagel, in I.F. 1, p. 333 ff.

[2] Meillet, in B.S.L. 34, p. 122 ff. That means that in these cases the pitch of the tone is not lowered.

[3] H. Jacobi, in K.Z. 35, p. 563 ff. F. Weller, in Festschrift-W. Schubring, Hamburg 1951, p. 180 ff. is however mistaken in assuming that the Vedic poems presuppose the penultimate accentuation.

[4] e.g. Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. XXX; Macdonell, Vedic grammar, p. 80; Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, I, 1, p. 210; E. Leumann, in K.Z. 31, p. 22 ff.

[5] Not to be called a circumflex (thus K. V. Abhyankar, A dictionary of Sanskrit grammar, Baroda 1961, p. 49).

[6] Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 113; 115.

[7] With Macdonell, o.c., p. 78.

[8] In accordance with ancient Indian authorities (cf. Pāṇini, 1, 2, 29 ff.; Vājasaneyi-prātiśākhya, 1, 108 ff.; 126; 4, 140; Ṛkprātiśākhya, 3, 1).

[9] Bloch, L'Indo-Aryen, p. 64 f. For particulars see also Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, I, 1, p. 280 f. etc.

sometimes represented by the aspirate: the Ṛgveda already exhibits forms of *grah-* "to seize, take" beside *grabh-* which must be older;[1] *hitá-* "put, placed" beside *-dhitá-* (*dhā-* "to place"); *kakuhá-* "lofty" instead of *kakubhá-*; *ihí* "go!" (< **i-dhí*: Gr. ἴθι) is then already the only form.[2] It may be observed that already in the prehistoric period I.E. *ĝh* had integrally become *h* and I.E. *gh* and *gᵘh* had shared this development before original *i-* and *e-*coloured sounds. Some particulars—e.g., the exact relation between *ahám* "I" and Lat. *ego*, Gr. ἐγώ—have however remained obscure, controversial, or open to different interpretations. Similar questions have been raised in connection with word pairs such as *śram-* "to be (become) tired": *klam-* "idem". Do both forms continue I.E. *ḱlem-*, the latter being irregular,[3] have we to assume two I.E. roots,[4] or does the root *klam-* represent an analogously enlarged word group originating in a younger Indian word?

In connection with the voiced sibilants (*z, ẓ*) which, while absent in Old Indian, must be assumed to have existed in the parent language in combination with voiced consonants and to have developed, in Indo-Iranian, from **ĝ* (and *źh* < **ĝh*) it may be conceded that these sounds, never being independent phonemes, must have easily become subject to remaking. The hypothesis[5] that medial *z* was replaced by *d* (hence *uṣád-bhis*, instr. plur. of *uṣás-* "dawn"), and medial *ẓ* by *ḍ* (*paḍ-bhís : pad-* "foot") makes it possible to dispense with the assumption of various parallel stems.[6]

The origin of the conspicuous feature in the Old Indian phonetic system, as old as the oldests texts, viz. the so-called cerebrals—"retroflex" or "retroverted consonants" would be more adequate terms—, which as a complete series are an Indo-Aryan innovation, was already discussed by Pott[7] who quite rightly held that they were partly due to the influence

---

[1] Sometimes, the form *gṛh-* belongs to *garh-* "to reproach": Wackernagel, in K.Z. 59, p. 23 ff.

[2] See J. Bloch, in M.S.L. 23, p. 175 (who on the strength of *śru-dhí* "hear" etc. and *brū-hí* "speak" etc. concluded that the *dh* was at an earlier date liable to reduction after a long syllabic or a dissyllabic stem); Meillet, in I.F. 31, p. 120 ff.

[3] Walde-Pokorny, Wörterbuch, I, p. 498 (Reihenwechsel); Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 75.

[4] Cf. V. Machek, in Slavia, 16, p. 187.

[5] G. H. Marsh, in J.A.O.S. 61, p. 45 ff. The occurrence of *réḍhi, léḍhi* "he licks" (I.E. root *leiĝh-*) beside *voḍhum*, inf. of *vah-* "to carry" (I.E. root * u̯eĝh- + -tum*) weakens the author's thesis that medial **aẓ* (< **aź* before a dental) regularly became *o*. Hesitatingly, Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 29 f.

[6] Compare already A. Kuhn, in K.Z. 1, p. 273 ff.; see also L. Bloomfield, in A.J.P. 32, p. 55 (a parallel stem in -*t*). The cerebral in *paḍbhis* (cf. Macdonell, Vedic Grammar, p. 34) has as far as I know defied solution; see Debrunner, Nachträge, I, p. 92).

[7] A. F. Pott, Etymologische Forschungen, Lemgo 1833-36, I, p. 88 f.; II, p. 19; 452. See also H. Reichelt, in Festschrift-W. Streitberg, Heidelberg 1924, p. 251 ff.

of ṣ (e.g., in *nīḍá-* "abode, a bird's nest" ⟨ **niẓḍá-* ⟨I.E. *niẓdó-*) or of *r* (which must have formed part of words such as *naṭ-* "to dance" ⟨ *nart-*) and partly to "other Indian languages". This threefold origin can, generally speaking, be retained in a modified form. After some discussion the data appeared to be in favour of the supposition that after *i-* and *u-*vowels, and after *r* and *k*, *s* had already in prehistoric times[1] (Iranian *š*, and to a certain extent a similar change in Slavonic) developed into ṣ: O.I. *juṣṭá-*, *júṣṭa-* "liked, pleased" (the ṭ is due to assimilation): cf. Lat. *gustus* "tasting"; Av. *āsišṭō* "quickest": Gr. ὤκιστος. In the wake of this ṣ there also occurred other cases of combinatory change. Fortunatov, establishing his much, and rightly, attacked "law",[2] instead of *r* as a factor in this process substituted the cerebralisation of dental occlusive, or *s*, after *l*, combining it with the disappearance of the *l* and a facultative lengthening of the preceding vowel. The reactions of other scholars to this hypothesis were largely determined by their evaluation of the influence of the substratum, which was by some of them either ignored or completely denied,[3] the cerebralisation being considered explicable as a dialectal development in some part of the Indo-Aryan area.[4]

A modification of Fortunatov's rule was—on the basis of a number of now mostly rejected etymologies—proposed by Scheftelowitz:[5] *n* and *s* following *l* become ṇ and ṣ while the *l* disappears and a preceding short vowel is lengthened. Others are inclined to reject it completely.[6] The etymologies quoted in support—e.g. *pāṇí-* "hand": Gr. παλάμη "palm of the hand"— are indeed highly disputable and alternative explanations on the basis of influence of the substratum often worth considering. Moreover, there is no denying that the third source of cerebrals—viz. other languages—was in the form of borrowings from Middle Indo-Aryan productive already at an early date: *vikaṭa-* "horrible, monstrous" is no doubt a Prākritism (in M.I.A. ṛ or *r* may cerebralise dentals) for *vikṛta-* "disfigured" which does not appear in the early period. In other cases, e.g. *taṇḍulá-* "grain (of rice)", a direct borrowing from a substratum is even more probable.

---

[1] For chronological particulars see W. Porzig, Die Gliederung des indogermanischen Sprachgebietes, Heidelberg 1954, p. 164 f. and A. Martinet, in Word, 11, p. 132.

[2] F. F. Fortunatov, in B.B. 6, p. 215 ff.; K.Z. 36, p. 1 ff.

[3] Bartholomae, in I.F. 3, p. 157 ff. and in Wochenschrift für Klass. Philologie, 15 (1898), p. 108 ff.

[4] The cerebral ṭ at the end of the ritual exclamation *śrauṣaṭ* "he (the god) must hear us" is—like the *au* instead of *o*—due to the special use of the word (cf. K. Hoffmann, in Z.D.M. G. 110, p. 176 f.) rather than Prākrit influence (thus W. Foy, in Z.D.M.G. 50, p. 139).

[5] I. Scheftelowitz, in K.Z. 53, p. 248 ff.; endorsed by Wüst, Indisch, p. 93; for literature see Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, I, 1, p. 241.

[6] Compare e.g. Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, I, p. 414 "kaum richtig"; II, p. 498 "aufzugeben"; the same, Über spontanen Zerebralnasal im frühen Indoarischen, in Mélanges-Renou, Paris 1968, p. 509 ff.; Kuiper, in Festschrift-Kirfel, Bonn 1955, p. 138.

Cerebrals are indeed abundantly found and no doubt ancient in Dravidian[1] and prevalent in most Austric languages of India, although they may perhaps not be original in that family. In cases such as Vedic *udumbára*- as against post-Vedic *uḍumbara*- "ficus glomerata" the Vedic dental has been ascribed to a tendency to avoid the cerebral;[2] that means that in later orthography the more popular and at the same time more exact or original pronunciation became evident.[3] Recently, preference was, in a number of cases, given to the hypothesis of a 'spontaneous cerebral nasal', if, at least, an etymology is otherwise impeccable (e.g. *sthū́ṇā*- "post, pillar": OPers. *stūnā* etc.); the question may however be raised as to how far this 'spontaneity' was conditioned by the influence of Prākrits and of the substratum.

Although such questions as will concern the Indo-europeanist rather than the Sanskrit scholar must remain undiscussed here, mention may be made of the vexed problem[4] presented by equations such as *tákṣan*- "carpenter": Gr. τέκτων; *kṣéti* "he dwells": Gr. κτίζω "I found, build", words which are undeniably related.[5] In search of a common source of O.I. ṣ and Gr. τ after *k* I.E. *s*, *t*, *þ* (Engl. *th*, a sound otherwise foreign to ancient Indo-European[6]) were tentatively presented for consideration,[7] a new series of affricate velars (*kˢ*, etc.) was postulated,[8] an infelicitous hypothesis suggested of a laryngeal from which the second element in the cluster might have resulted[9] and a wholly rejectable opinion ventured[10] according to which in the case of *kṣi-*: κτι- a reduced form of the root **tekṣ*- "to construct" is involved with varying suffixes *(*tks-i, *tks-ti-)*.[11]

---

[1] See e.g. J. Bloch, in B.S.O.S. 5, p. 731 ff. For a bibliography see Debrunner, Nachträge, I, p. 88 f.

[2] Kuiper, Proto-Munda words, p. 24 f.; 82.

[3] For the comparatively recent change of intervocalic *ḍ* and *ḍh* to *ḷ* and *ḷh* in the Ṛgveda see e.g. Meillet, in I.F. 31, p. 122 ff.; Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 17. For initial and internal alternations between the cerebrals (e.g. *ṭ*/*ḍ*) see Burrow, in B.S.O.A.S. 12, p. 135; Wüst, PHMA, 3, p. 5 ff. See also K. Hoffmann, Die alt-indoarischen Wörter mit *ṇḍ*, besonders im Ṛgveda, (unpublished) thesis München 1941 (morphological analysis, often disputable etymologies, discussion of points of dialectal, sociological, religious, interest).

[4] Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, I, p. 468.

[5] See e.g. Hj. Frisk, Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, II, Heidelberg 1961 ff., p. 35.

[6] For a brief statement of the problem of the I.E. 'interdental spirants' see Lehmann, o.c., p. 99 f.

[7] For particulars see Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. 239 ff.; Debrunner, Nachträge, I, p. 134; E. Schwyzer, Griechische Grammatik, I, München 1939, p. 326.

[8] Benveniste, in B.S.L. 38, p. 139 ff.

[9] L. L. Hammerich, Laryngeal before sonant, Copenhagen 1948, p. 15 ff.

[10] Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 81.

[11] Cf. Benveniste, in B.S.L. 51, 2, p. 25; M. Leumann, in Kratylos, I, p. 29; Debrunner, Nachträge, I, p. 134.

The treatment of I.E. r and l[1] requires a longer discussion.[2] Whereas both sounds appear indiscriminately as r in Iranian, and Classical Sanskrit has l as well as r (without distributing them exactly like the parent language), there are certain Eastern dialects of Indo-Aryan which possess only l. The Ṛgveda has a decided preference for r, most words containing l being rarely used, with the exception of, e.g., *bála-* "strength". Endeavours to account for this situation by accentual differences, special phonetic developments, or a hypothesis of three I.E. liquids, were in vain.[3] A comparison between Vedic and the later language shows that the latter often has l where the former has r, but the parent language must have had l (e.g., *raghú-* "light, rapid" : *laghu-* : Gr. ἐλαχύς, Lat. *levis*); many later words containing l are not found in the Ṛgveda, but their number increases in the later parts of the Veda;[4] some derivatives which have become isolated from their group have, however, in Ṛgveda as well as elsewhere, preserved an original l : *ślóka-* "verse" : *śru-* "to hear", but Gr. κλυτός, Lat. *inclutus*, etc. These facts are best explained as dialectal differences.[5] The l-speaking Easterners may be supposed to represent an earlier wave of invasion, the speakers of the N.W. dialect, which was at the basis of the language of the Ṛgveda, turned l into r in the same way as their Iranian neighbours. Classical Sanskrit developing from a more easterly variety of Old Indo-Aryan but strongly influenced by Vedic exhibits both sounds, not rarely in variants of the original form, with a number of interesting semantic differences already in the Veda : *lup-* "to break, hurt" : *rup-* "to suffer violent pain (from colic)".[6] The occurrence of the l in some Ṛgvedic words needs, however, supplementary explanation. An alternative hypothesis[7] based on the assumption of social differences[8]—the l being characteristic of the agriculturists (cf., e. g., *loṣṭá-* "lump of clay"; *lā́ngala-* "plough") who tended to borrow more words from the substratum[9] than the cultured class

---

[1] In the XIXth century the Vedic situation led some scholars to assume only I.E. r; see e.g. F. Bechtel, Die Hauptprobleme der indogerm. Lautlehre, Göttingen 1892, p. 380 ff.; Bartholomae, in I.F. 3, p. 157 ff.

[2] Cf. H. Lüders, in Festschrift-J. Wackernagel, Göttingen 1923, p. 546 (= Philologica indica, Göttingen 1940, p. 546 ff.).

[3] For a bibliography: Debrunner, Nachträge, I, p. 117.

[4] E. V. Arnold, in Festgruss-R. v. Roth, Stuttgart 1893, p. 145 ff.

[5] Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. XXI; Meillet, in I.F. 31 (1912-13), p. 124 f.; Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 82 ff. In individual cases (ṚV. *aśrīrá-* "of bad aspect": *aślīlá-*) dissimilation may have played a part.

[6] If I.E. **louko-* (> O.I. *loka-* "room to live in, place of safety or sanctity, etc.") was an open place to which the light of day had access, the rare *roká-* "light, lightness" seems to have preserved an aspect of the old meaning.

[7] K. Ammer, in W.Z.K.M. 51, p. 116 ff.

[8] Wackernagel, in Festgabe-H. Jacobi, Bonn 1926, p. 13 (= Kleine Schriften, I, 1, p. 429).

[9] Among these may have been *laspūjaní-* "a large needle"; *labá-* "quail"; *lā́ngala-*

of the poets and their patrons—which meets this requirement is not incompatible with the former theory: if the speech of the true exponents
of the Vedic culture was, like Iranian, absolutely free from the *l*, occurrences of this sound may be due to the idiom of a 'substratum' of *l*-speakers
who had stayed behind to be incorporated members of the 'agricultural
class': hence also the (rare) occurrences of words such as *plúṣi*- "flea";
puṃścalī- "harlot".[1]

As stated in chapter I the Veda reveals quite a number of traces of what
is generally indicated by the term 'dialectic differences', authors offering
no opinion on the question as to whether these were mainly geographical
or social in nature. Wackernagel,[2] who—after some pertinent remarks
made by others[3]—furnished his readers with a by no means exhaustive
list of examples, was substantially right in his view that in the times of
the Vedic poets—I would prefer: in Vedic antiquity—part of the Indo-
Aryan population must have spoken a more evolved form of language
characterized by (some of the) main features of Middle Indian. The extent
to which such 'dialectic phonology' appears in the Veda could not however be fully appreciated before the publication of Bloomfield's Vedic
Variants.[4] From the extensive collections of material contained in this
useful repertory it appears that there are not only phonetic variants which
may prove the existence of Middle Indian peculiarities[5]—such as a spelling
piga- instead of the normal form of the bird's name *pika-;* the change of
y to *j*, and that of *j* to *y*;[6] that of *kṣ, ts, ps* to *ch*; the very numerous interchanges between *r* and other vowels *(a, i, u)*, e.g., an incongruous *samid-
dham* "inflamed" instead of *samṛddham* "prosperous"; the change of *aya*
to *e*, and *ava* to *o;* the appearance of an epenthetic vowel (mostly *i*), etc.—
but also deviations from the normal usage which must have been occasioned by the sometimes overdone effort to avoid a 'dialectic' pronunciation:
hence such hyper-Sanskritisms as *jyām* instead of *dyām* "heaven".[7]

A few points call for an expatiation. The three sibilants which in Middle

"plough"; *lājās* "fried grain". I cannot subscribe to Ammer's (o.c., p. 133 ff.) supposition
of an influence exerted by the cult of Rudra-Śiva. See also Mayrhofer, in Arch. Ling. 2, p.
44.
[1] With *"l* der Plebeität", Wackernagel, l.c.
[2] Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. XVIII f. See also Meillet, in I.F. 31 (1912-13), p. 120 ff.
[3] See Th. Benfey in G.G.A. 1846, p. 754; P. v. Bradke, in Z.D.M.G. 40 (1886), p. 668 ff.
[4] M. Bloomfield, F. Edgerton, M. B. Emeneau, Vedic variants, 3 vol., Philadelphia 1930-
34.
[5] Edgerton, in Language, 10, p. 242, speaks of "the disturbing influence of foreign (i.e.
chiefly later) dialects".
[6] Cf. Wackernagel, o.c., I, p. 208 f.; 163.
[7] F. Edgerton, in Studies in honor of H. Collitz, Baltimore 1930, p. 25 ff.; Renou, Introduction générale, p. 7 f.; 13.

Indo-Aryan coalesce into *s*, are, especially in texts other than the Ṛgveda, often confused,[1] a fact already attested by Patañjali[2] (IInd cent. B.C.) with regard to *ś* and *ṣ*, but sometimes underrated by those modern lexicographers who postulated, e.g., a root *śru-* "to flow" beside *sru-*.[3] The uncertainty as to the writing of *b* or *v* throughout Sanskrit literary tradition[4] is not foreign to the manuscripts of the Veda, the variants being almost all purely phonetic, e.g., *paḍvīśa-* for ṚV. *paḍbīśa-* "fetter". The well-known Middle Indian rule of the two morae—no syllable is 'overlong' —seems to account for variants such as *paḍvīśa-* and *paḍviṃśa-* ; *rāye : rayyai; vītam : vittam*. If a variant at the same time means a lexical change (like the above *samṛddham : samiddham*), it may also point to misunderstanding of the text.

---

[1] I. Scheftelowitz, in W.Z.K.M. 21, p. 132 ff.; the same, in I.L. 3 (1933), p. 143 ff.
[2] Patañjali, Mahābhāṣya, I, p. 24 Kielhorn.
[3] Petr. Dict. VII, 383.
[4] Wackernagel, o.c., I, p. 183; Debrunner, Nachträge, I, p. 101.

CHAPTER THREE

THE NOUN

Already at an early date the Sanskrit scholars of the West devoted, in imitation of the great Indian grammarians, much room to a reasoned survey of the formation of nominal stems: in Benfey's Handbuch of 1852 this subject takes up no less than 205 pages, in Whitney's Sanskrit grammar 62 pages, in Renou's Grammaire védique 46 pages, in Wackernagel-Debrunner's Grammatik the whole of volume II, 2, 940 pages. The authors accurately gave particulars about the declension, internal sandhi, the place of the accent, vocalism and vowel alternations, the type of derivatives formed (e.g. from non-compound verbal roots).[1]

It is self-evident that even the wealth of material accumulated in Wackernagel-Debrunner's volume on Die Nominalsuffixe[2] and the ability and sagacity with which it has been worked up should not prevent us from stating that many details were, or still are, awaiting fresh investigation and many lines of thought further development. Thus the relation between the suffixes -tāt-, -tāti- and -tā- —which in the oldest documents is much rarer than the 'synonymous' -tva- —could be more precisely stated:[3] the two former formations appear to be mutually supplementary but not semantically interchangeable, the nouns ending in -tāti- —which were to be replaced by those in -tā- —being abstracts, the instrumentals in -tāt-ā expressing a characteristic mode of being. Unfortunately, the number of the instances and occurrences is limited.

There is no point in pursuing in this survey the questions as to the origin of the formative elements, their mutual (prehistoric) relations and the possibilities of their being the product of coalescense of shorter elements, questions which after having fascinated the first generation of comparative linguists are every now and then trotted out.[4] That is why

---

[1] An exposition of the facts (saṃhitās) and complete lists of nouns occurring in the Ṛgveda was given by B. Lindner, Altindische Nominalbildung nach den Saṃhitās dargestellt, Jena 1877. A very useful collection of materials may also be found in Ch.R. Lanman, A statistical account of noun-inflection in the Veda, in J.A.O.S. 10 (1880), p. 325 ff. —For a brief characterization of the morphology of the Ṛgveda see L. Renou, Histoire de la langue sanskrite, Lyon-Paris 1956, p. 17 ff.

[2] Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, II, 2; see p. 620 ff.

[3] L. Renou, in B.S.L. 55 (1960), p. 10 ff.

[4] For instance without due reserve by Burrow, Sanskrit language, *passim*, whose thesis (p. 164) that the reason that e.g. formations in -t- are so rare is that "as a general rule they have been supplanted by extensions of the simple t-suffix (-ti-, -tā-)" is incapable of proof; it

I refrain also from surveying the mostly unpromising speculations in which many scholars have engaged about prehistoric connections between for instance the formative elements with a *t* and the well-known determinative -*t*-[1] which forms nominal stems for roots ending in the short vowels *i*, *u* and *r̥*[2] and which, while recurring also in other languages[3] (Lat. *anti-sti-t-* stem of *antistes* "overseer", cf. Vedic compounds such as *deva-stú-t-* "praising the gods"), is incidentally added to inherited stems that elsewhere exist without this sound (*yák-r̥-t-* "liver": gen. *yak-n-ás;* cf. Av. *yākar∂;* Gr. ἧπαρ, gen. ἥπατος). The fact that, for instance, adjectives in -*in*- and in -*īyas*- are not rarely found to exist side by side *(jav-ín-* "quick": *jáv-īyas-)* does not prove their etymological relation.[4]

Thus a genetical relationship is difficult to discover between the *k* which in a number of cases appears at the end of (partly etymologically obscure) adverbs (*tāják* "suddenly"; *pr̥thak* "singly")—and which, notwithstanding the synonymity of *madrík* "towards me" and *madryàk* (neuter of *madryàñc*-) has nothing to do with the adjectives in -*añc*-[5]—and the in later times exceedingly frequent and much ramified suffix -*ka*-.[6] This -*ka*-,[7] on the other hand, functioning as a primary suffix to form some adjectives (*śúṣka*- "dried") and (mostly as -*aka*-: in the R̥gveda only *sā́yaka*- "missile") nouns—and, likewise as a result of metanalysis (*pramāyu-* : *pramāyu-ka-* > *pramāy-uka*- "dying away"), as -*uka*-, which becomes frequent in the brāhmaṇas, also adjectives of the force of durative participles (*kṣódh-uka*- "hungry")—is in very frequent use in secondary derivatives so as to form, inter alia, diminutives (*putra-ká* "little son"), adjectives of the sense of "more or less..." (*babhru-ká*- "brownish") and words which are—at least as far as we are able to see—practically identical in sense with their bases: *dūraké* (loc. sing.) "far away"; hence, possibly (though it is always

---

should not be forgotten that many -*tā*-words owe their existence to analogy. For speculations concerning the origin of the suffix -*i̯os*- and an incredible relationship with the suffix -*es-*/-*os*-: (after many others: Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, II, 2, p. 461) O. Friš, in Arch. Or. 21 (1953), p. 101 ff.; for an unconvincing suggestion to connect suffixes containing an *i* (-*in*-, -*i̯os*- etc.): A. Erhart, ibidem, 24, p. 432 ff.; the unmethodical article on independent suffixes by T. Bolelli, in Annali della Scuola normale di Pisa, Lett. II, 18 (1949), p. 82 ff. need not detain us.

[1] See e.g. De Saussure, in M.S.L. 3, p. 197 ff. (= Recueil, p. 339 ff.); Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 163 ff.

[2] Macdonell, Vedic grammar, p. 186 ff.

[3] Not all parallel instances enumerated in Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, II, 2, p. 46 are unambiguous.

[4] as was suggested by Erhart, o.c., p. 435.

[5] as was supposed by Benfey, Sāmavedārcikam, Leipzig 1848, p. 36. See Renou, in Ehrengabe-W. Geiger, Leipzig 1931, p. 161 ff.

[6] F. Edgerton, The *k*-suffixes of Indo-Iranian, I (Veda and Avesta), Thesis John Hopkins Univ., Leipzig 1911 (= J.A.O.S. 31, p. 93 ff.; 296 ff.).

[7] Whitney, Grammar, p. 445; 449 f.; 467 ff.

unaccented), also -*ka*- as a samāsānta i.e. a secondary suffix at the end of a compound[1] (*a-karṇá-ka*- "without ears"), a function which has also— and on good grounds—been regarded[2] as modelled upon the adjectives of appurtenance in -*ka*- (*ánta-ka*- "end-making": *ánta*- "end"); though rare in the oldest Veda, this function was no doubt inherited[3] (Lat. *civis* "citizen": *civicus* "of, pertaining to citizens"; Old Persian *a-nāma-ka*- "without a name"). It may in this connection be recalled that this suffix like most other productive suffixes was thematic. Further that in the Veda -*ka*- proper presents itself "as a single unified and coherent suffix", the widely divergent meanings shown in some later developments being demonstrably secondary in point of time.[4] There is however no classical use of the -*ka*- suffix which is not foreshadowed in the Veda, however small its beginnings.

Nor can it be part of our task to recount the story of those suffixes which as for instance -*tvaná*- (*pati-tvaná*- "matrimony")—also found in Avestan and described as a moribund element "manipulated to give archaic effect by late poets"[5]—occur only in the oldest texts to turn up again in Prā-krit.

Suffixes being as a rule of prehistoric or unknown origin certainty of their oldest function (meaning) is not in sight. Although in this survey problems of comparative linguistics are left out of consideration there must be room for the remark that a formation which at first sight seems to be identical with a definite formation in cognate languages and has indeed long been regarded as such, may be shown to have originated not before the Indo-Iranian period.[6] Whereas-, for instance, Meillet assumed the existence of an I.E. suffix -*ne/os*-, we now express ourselves more cautiously: Latin words such as *vulnus*, *munus*, *pignus* are not etymologically related to any I.I. word, and in Sanskrit there exist seven other words which, while denoting some form of property (e.g. *rék-nas*-"property"), occur already in the oldest sources; one of them may, on the strength of a German relative, be old and have started an analogical series. The function of the suffix in the Veda is no doubt gravely misunderstood if

---

[1] Renou, o.c., p. 161.
[2] Wackernagel, Grammatik, II, 1, p. 105.
[3] This fact should not be ignored; and in explanation of the rareness of these adjectives in Vedic poetry it may be observed that the early Greek poets did not like their counterparts in -ικό-ς either and that in Latin a considerable part of them belonged to more or less technical and special vocabularies.
[4] Edgerton, o.c., p. 95.
[5] E. W. Hopkins, in J.A.O.S. 17, p. 37.
[6] Meillet, in M.S.L. 15 (1908), p. 256; J. Manessy-Guitton, Les noms sanscrits en -*nas*-, in I.I.J., 8, p. 171 ff.

the existence of any discernible distinction of meaning between root nouns or "original simple suffixes", whatever reality they may have represented, and (words formed with) full-fledged suffixes, for instance between *dviṣ*- "hatred" and *dveṣas*-, is[1] denied. What strikes us in perusing the grammars and the many monographs devoted to this subject is on the contrary the increasing endeavour to determine on the one hand the function of the suffixes, that is to say, to detect, as far as possible, some general idea that all words formed with the same suffix have in common and, on the other, the differences in sense, however slight, between the nominal derivatives of the same root.[2]

Whereas, for instance, Benfey[3] in discussing the use of the suffix -*as*-[4] limited himself to an enumeration of the type of roots to which it was appended, Whitney[5] observed that it helps to make "especially a large class of neuter nouns, mostly abstract (action-nouns), but sometimes assuming a concrete value"; according to Wackernagel-Debrunner[6] these derivatives denote mostly the performance of the process expressed by the root, e.g., *áv-as*- "help, assistance", sometimes however that which is produced by the process: *vác-as*- "word", *śráv-as*- "renown" ("what is heard": *śru*- "to hear") and a number of "concreta" which often refer to parts of the body: *úras*- "breast"; *cákṣ-as*- "eye". Attempts at determining the function of this formative element more accurately were however wholly justified and fruitful. Thus definitions were proposed such as: words in -*as*- denote objects which overwhelm man by their vagueness and incomprehensibility,[7] or entities, phenomena or concepts which are "mit übermächtigen Kräften ausgestattet".[8] There cannot indeed be doubt that these words which belong to a rather limited number of semantic categories[9] (which are distinctions of our devising)—also psychical faculties, 'qualities' (e.g. *tej-as*- "brilliant energy",[10] demoniac powers, attitudes

---

[1] with Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 118.

[2] See e.g. the remarks made by Renou, in B.S.O.A.S. 20, p. 471 ff. in conclusion of a study of some derivatives of *dā*- "to give": (p. 475) "s'ils sont faiblement distincts sur le plan strictement sémantique, (ils) n'en composent pas moins de petits groupes bien différenciés d'après la fonction grammaticale ou le formulaire". For the competition between various formations see also J. Kuryłowicz, Les adjectifs thématiques à feminin en -*ī*-, in Studies-F. B. J. Kuiper, p. 46 ff.

[3] Benfey, Grammatik, p. 149.

[4] For these words now see J. Manessy, Les substantives en -*as*- dans la Ṛk-Saṃhitā, Dakar 1961.

[5] Whitney, p. 428. Similarly, Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 152 f.

[6] Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, II, 2, p. 229.

[7] W. Porzig, in Indogermanisches Jahrbuch 12, p. 352; cf. also the same Atti IIIrd Congrès intern. des linguistes (Roma 1933), p. 296.

[8] F. Specht, Der Ursprung der indogermanischen Deklination, Göttingen 1947, p. 356.

[9] These classes of meaning recur in the cognate languages: O.I. -*as*- < I.E. -*es*-/-*os*-.

[10] *téjas*- "the sharpness, glow, glare, and at the same time energy of the sun and fire" also

(e.g. *nam-as-* "homage")—generally speaking denoted power concepts or rather 'power-substances'[1] and it is only due to a misunderstanding that they refer to abstract ideas[2] in our sense of this term and sometimes also to concreta. Words such as *oj-as-* "a particular sort of creative and inaugurative power" stand for potencies which within some form of experience were supposed to be present in persons, things and phenomena by virtue of which these are in some way or other powerful, effective, influential, endowed with special energy. It is in perfect harmony with what we know about the semasiology of similar 'concepts' in other archaic and semi-primitive milieus that for instance *śráv-as-* not only denotes "glory" but also "glorious deed" and the glory consisting of an endowment or in gaining a prize. The distinction made in modern dictionaries between 'abstract' and 'concrete' meanings is often very difficult to maintain, or rather not applicable,[3] and in particular cases it is even impossible to settle, whether in our categories and in our terminology, a person or an impersonal idea is meant. Thus both 'meanings'—that is translations— of *dveṣas-*, viz. "hostility" and "enemy" "spielen vielfach in einander über".[4] Since the related categories in the cognate languages may generally speaking be judged in the same way this function of this class of words may be regarded as inherited.

The oxytone so-called adjectives in *-as-*,[5] part of which are coupled with barytone but otherwise identical substantives (*rakṣ-ás-* "evil being": *rákṣ-as-* "harm, evil power" cf. in Greek ψευδής "lying": ψεῦδος "falsehood") cannot be considered full-fledged adjectives:[6] never qualifying neuter nouns they really are a sort of apposition which may be used as nouns. Those in *-vas-* (e.g. *cakh-vás-* "extending(?)") joined the perfect participle active.

From a detailed study of the—especially in the higher literature—very frequent primary suffix *-ti-*[7] it appeared that it was as a rule attached to a root in the weak grade; in this it is in harmony with the verbal adjectives in *-tá-* with which it seems to be so closely associated that many *-ti-*

---

and very often untranslatably used for the powerful brilliant energy, dignity and influence which is characteristic of gods, ascetics, kings and other mighty or important beings (J. Ph. Vogel, Het Sanskrit woord *tejas*, Amsterdam Acad. 1930).

[1] J. Gonda, Ancient-Indian *ojas*, Utrecht 1952, esp. p. 46 ff.; 67 ff.

[2] Thus e.g. Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, I, 2, p. 104; Meillet, Introduction, p. 259.

[3] If we are aware of this fact, we shall not misunderstand Mme Manessy, Les substantives en *-as-*, p. 249: the suffix "est apte à porter des significations abstraites aussi bien que concrètes: forces et substances, l'action et la matière même de l'action".

[4] Grassmann, Wörterbuch, 653.

[5] Manessy-Guitton, in I.I.J. 7 (1964), p. 259 ff.

[6] Cf. also Whitney, Grammar, p. 111.

[7] G. Liebert, Das Nominalsuffix *-ti-* im Altindischen, Lund 1949.

nouns were formed after *-tá-* adjectives. Curiously enough *-ti-* nouns beside very common verbs may be rare or wanting in the Veda, e.g. *mṛti-* "death" (Latin *morti-* ⟨ I.E. **mṛti-*). The greater part of them appear after a prefix, that is, they belong to compound verbs, or as second members of compounds; the thesis that this originally was their only use[1] cannot however be substantiated. Only in a few cases a noun in *-iti-* arose beside an adjective in *-itá-*. Nouns in *-ti-* deriving from a strong root are mostly closely connected with similar verb forms, e.g. *rā-tí-* "gift" : *rā-sva* "give". About the function of this suffix there has been some difference of opinion, some scholars improbably supposing the 'abstract' force to be secondary and a 'concrete' force or a function as nomen agentis to have been more original,[2] others describing them as abstracts[3] or as nomina actionis,[4] or even as nomina actionis "welche die Handlung an sich ausdrücken, ohne dass damit ausgesagt wird, ob die Aktion abgeschlossen wird bzw. ob sie zu einem Ergebnis führt".[5] 'Abstract' is however here also a rather vague and misleading notion, because various manifestations of e.g. *ū-tí-* "help" can bear that name, whether we translate by "helper, furtherer", "means of helping", or "enjoyment, relief"; *kṣi-ti-* (*kṣi-* "to abide, reside") is contextually translatable by "abode, settlement, nation".[6]

Leaving the proto-history of the formative element *-tha-*[7] out of consideration we only notice that it helped to form, in the oldest documents, so-called verbal abstracts, and as final members of compounds some masculine action words (*ava-bhṛ-thá-* 'carrying off', i.e. 'purificatory bath'); it moreover joined nominal stems (cardinals etc.: *catur-thá-* "the fourth") and, combining with *-iṣ-* (⟩ *-iṣṭha-*), superlatives.[8]

A study of the evidence provided by the comparison of the ancient Indo-European languages was believed to enable some insight to be gained into a certain Lautbedeutsamkeit of definite formative elements. Thus the *u* might have symbolized something grand, mighty, powerful[9] (*cákṣ-u-* "the eye"). It is however difficult to decide whether the existence

---

[1] Renou, in Revue des études indo-européennes, 1 (Bucarest 1938), p. 157 ff.
[2] Specht, Ursprung, p. 386 ff.
[3] Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, II, 2, p. 622.
[4] Renou, Grammaire sanscrite, p. 220.
[5] Liebert, o.c., p. 214.
[6] Otherwise Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 156: "noms d'action librement apposés à des noms animés".
[7] Hj. Frisk, Suffixales *-th-* im Indogermanischen, Göteborg 1936. See also ch. II, p. 30 f.
[8] See further on, p. 53.
[9] W. Havers, Zur Entstehung eines sogenannten sakralen *u*-Elementes in den indogermanischen Sprachen, Anzeiger der phil.-hist. Klasse der Österreichischen Akad. d. Wissenschaften 1947, 15, p. 139 ff. Before him F. Specht had spoken of a "sakral-kultisches" *u*: cf. Indogermanisches Jahrbuch, 26, p. 80. Otherwise N. S. Trubetzkoy, in B.S.L. 24, p. 130 f.

of numerous roots in or with *u* denoting the idea of washing, bathing (e.g. O.I. *pū-: pávate, punáti; dhávati, -te; śúndhate* "he purifies himself") have anything to do[1] with the ritual significance of this—in daily life probably rare—activity. When such sounds belong to a limited number of roots, it may be a matter of chance; if they are suffixal, we should take into account the probability of secondary analogy whatever the force of the oldest occurrences of this element. That appearances may be deceptive was demonstrated in connection with some adjectives ending in *u: uru-* "broad, wide" is a root-noun (basis *$*u(e)r$-ə-u-*) rather than a derivative with the suffix *-u-*.[2]

Whereas, according to Benveniste, Vedic man in using a noun in *-ti-* emphasized the accomplishment of a process, the derivative nouns in *-tu-*, which are fewer in number, served him to bring the ideas of disposition or destination to the fore.[3] Not all instances being however convincing and a detailed semantic investigation being omitted it was observed[4] that—in Vedic as well as other I.E. languages—many words in *-tu-*[5] semantically belong to the spheres of divine power, rituals, sacrifices, law, magic (Lat. *cultus, ritus*), life-processes, natural phenomena, food etc. and other entities of socio-religious import. Thus Ved. *gātú-* "way" is used as the "way" to heaven or immortality, and as "the way of escape shown to a man in distress": "type de mot appartenant à la zone hiératique du vocabulaire".[6] We should however remember that we do not know how this word and others of the same class were used in daily life.[7]

Words with the suffix *-man-* (< I.E. *-men-*)—e.g. in *dhā-man-* "the presence of a divine power", *bráh-man-, ój-man-* "vigour, energy"—are the Indian representatives of the well-known Indo-European formation in *-men-* which not infrequently denotes some power or other (cf. Latin *numen* "the divine will or sway"; *carmen* "incantation, oracular response etc."), especially when this power manifests itself either as such, in objects or processes believed to be bearers of power, or in powerful beings[8] such as *brah-mán-* "the brahman" (notice the accent).

---

[1] Specht, in Die Sprache, 1, p. 43 ff.

[2] J. Manessy-Guitton, in Word, 19, p. 31 ff. Cf. Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 155 on some words ending in *i*.

[3] E. Benveniste, Noms d'agent et noms d'action en indo-européen, Paris 1948, p. 87 ff.

[4] W. Havers, Zum Bedeutungsinhalt eines indogermanischen Suffixes, in Anthropos, 49 (1954), p. 182 ff. For other criticism of Benveniste's conclusions see O. Szemerényi, in Arch. ling. (Glasgow), 1 (1948), p. 189 f.

[5] Renou, Monographies sanskrites, Paris 1937, II.

[6] Renou, Monographies sanskrites, II, p. 7.

[7] The development of the infinitive in *-tum*, hardly perceptible in the Ṛgveda, may be recounted in a chapter on syntax. See p. 136.

[8] Porzig, in I.F. 42, p. 223 ff.

One should not[1] describe the adjectives in -(ī)yas- as normal comparatives. Their oldest function recognizable is to denote a marked degree of a quality, excluding in any case the opposite idea: návyas-, návīyas- "distinctly new"; tár-īyas- "easily passing through". Not all of them are associated with other adjectives of the same root; kánīyas- "younger (of brothers or sisters)" was attached by the grammarians to yúvan- "young" or álpa- "small", but kanyà- means "a girl, virgin, daughter".

The interrelations between the formative elements proved a grateful object of investigation. A curious survival of an old substitution is retained in á-kravi-hasta- "not having bloody hands" as against krūra- "bloody, cruel": the adjective ending in -rá- takes the suffix -i- when it figures as the first member of a compound (cf. Gr. κυδι-άνειρα "bringing glory to men": κυδρό-ς "glorious").[2] There are unmistakable associations between adjectives in -rá- and substantives in -as-: das-rá- "accomplishing marvellous deeds": dáṃs-as- "marvellous deed"; ug-rá- "creatively powerful, energetic and influential etc.": ój-as- "creative and inauguratory energy".[3] Compare, in Greek, κῦδ-ος "renown, majesty": κυδ-ρό-ς "renowned, glorious". During the Indo-Iranian period the number of adjectives in -rá- qualifying a person or object as endowed with a special form of power or ability increased:[4] śak-rá- "mighty"; paj-rá- "strong, solid". These adjectives are also closely associated with those in -(ī)-yas- and -iṣ-ṭha-: ug-rá-, ój-īyas-, dū-rá- "distant": dáv-īyas- (cf. Gr. κυδ-ρό-ς: κύδ-ισ-το-ς), which are on the other hand also allied to adjectives in -u-: gur-ú- "heavy": gár-īyas- (cf. ταχ-ύ-ς "swift": τάχ-ισ-το-ς). In the framework of such a 'Suffixverband',[5] which is a synchronic phenomenon, words which are felt to be wanting may be supplied along analogical ways.

The relations between derivatives belonging to the same word family may in the course of time undergo a change resulting in a new analogical development. Thus the adjectives in -(ī)yas- which, being formed with a primary suffix, originally were also in meaning intimately associated with the root[6] (pan- "to praise": pan-īyas- "especially worthy of praise") came to be connected with adjectives, e.g. tej-īyas- "uncommonly sharp" with tig-má- "sharp", so that e.g. sán-yas- "comparatively old" could arise beside sana- "old". As, however, substantives in -as- and adjectives in -(ī)-

---

[1] with Whitney, Grammar, p. 173; Kuryłowicz, in Festschrift-Debrunner, Bern 1954, p. 256, and others.

[2] W. Caland, in K.Z. 31, p. 267; 32, p. 592.

[3] Gonda, Ancient-Indian ojas, p. 82 f.

[4] Frisk, Zur indoiranischen und griechischen Nominalbildung, Göteborg 1934, p. 3 ff.

[5] For this term see M. Leumann, in Mélanges-L. Renou, Paris 1968, p. 467 ff.

[6] I prefer this formulation to Kuryłowicz's (in Festschrift-Debrunner, p. 256) "-(i)yas- d'origine verbale".

yas- -iṣ-ṭha- were often more or less systematically connected with verbs (*ávati* "he favours, helps": *áv-as-*, *áv-iṣṭha-*) new so-called comparative and superlative stems would come into existence even beside compound verbs: *úd-yam-īyas-* "raising excessively".[1] Individual elements may on the other hand dissociate themselves from their Suffixverband to enter into the composition of other systems. Thus the adjectives in *-u-* deriving from secondary verbs developed special connections with the participles in *-ant-*—with which they agreed in function: *devayú-* : *devayánt-* "turning to the gods"[2]—and the verbal abstracts in *-ā-* belonging to these formations. After models such as *daṃs-ú-* "accomplishing marvellous deeds", *r̥ju-* "straight", which belonged to inherited word families, were formed *nr̥t-ú-* "dancing"; *krīḍ-ú-* "sporting" (*krīḍ-á-* "sport") etc., derivatives of re-duplicated verbal stems such as *ji-gy-ú-* "victorious", and in the R̥gveda also more than a dozen *-u-* derivatives of desiderative stems in *-s-*: *ji-gī-ṣ-ú-* "wishing to conquer". The instances of the latter well-known type were soon followed by the nouns in *-ā-*.[3] Since adjectives in *-u-* deriving from verbs in *-ya-* were apt to be re-interpreted as derivatives in *-yu-* (*śravas-yá-ti* "he wishes to be renowned": *śravasy-ú-* "desirous of renown" > *śravas-yú-*), new forms of this type could easily appear beside any verbal *-ya-* formation: *bhāváyati* "he promotes, furthers": *bhāva-yú-* "wishing to further".

From a circumstantial account of all elements containing an *s*[4] it appeared that there are, in Old Indian, only a few inherited derivatives based on stems in *-es-/-os-*. The only productive type is that of the adjectives on *-as-a-*,[5] e.g. *nabhasá-* "misty": *nábhas-* "(clouded) sky", existing beside a number of substantives which are unaccompanied by nouns in *-as-* such as e.g. *camasá-* "drinking-vessel". These *-s-* formations must be kept distinct from those words which are neither formally nor semantically associated with nouns in *-as-*, for instance *śru-ṣ-ṭí-* "obedience", which cannot be connected with *śráv-as-* "renown" but belongs intimately to the desiderative verb *śu-śrū-ṣ-a-ti* "he wishes to hear, is obedient"; *san-i-ṣ-yú-* "wishing to acquire": *san-i-ṣyá-ti* "to wish to acquire".[6] The pro-

---

[1] Not to be regarded, with Grassmann, Wörterbuch, 254, as a "Comparativbildung zu einem Positiv *udyám-*".

[2] Gonda, in A.B.O.R.I., 15, p. 307 ff.

[3] Leumann, o.c., p. 469 ff. who may be right (p. 472 f.) in opining that the derivatives of the monosyllabic desiderative stems (type *dit-s-ú-* "wishing to give"; *bhik-ṣ-u-* "mendicant") preceded chronologically those of the dissyllabic stems, although only a few of these occur in early texts.

[4] Manessy-Guitton, Recherches sur les dérivés nominaux à bases sigmatiques en sanscrit et en latin, Dakar 1963.

[5] See also Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, II, 2, p. 136 and 236.

[6] In speaking in connection with these modifications of the idea expressed by the root

lem how to distinguish between homophone formative elements is, in case distinct semantic criteria are wanting, apt to become insoluble if one would prefer to study the language only from the synchronic point of view. This is however not to say that a diachronic approach to the problems connected with those formative elements which make the impression of being composite always leads to a solution. Whereas for instance *gábhasti-* "arm, hand" may tentatively be connected with *gabhīrá-* "deep" and other words for "deep, hollow, concave"[1] and *kṣípasti-* "arm" may be related to *kṣip-* "to throw", other words confront us with crucial questions: has *pavásta-* of uncertain meaning ("cover"?) anything to do with other Old Indian words beginning with *pav-?;* does it really contain a suffixal *-asta-?*[2]

In favourable circumstances the composite character of a suffixal element may be clearly recognized. Thus *(saṃ)vatsará-* "year" may be understood as a derivative in *-a-* of **vat-s-ar-* which itself was a noun in *-ar-* derived from the weak stem of **vat-as-* which then is identical with Gr. Ϝέτος "year".[3] It is however not surprising that in particular cases the determination of the suffixal element has led to serious differences of opinion. Does, for instance, *rátna-* "wealth etc." contain the suffix *-tna-*, which is found also in *cyautná-* "enterprise" (*cyu-* "to bring about etc.");[4] does its first vowel represent an intermediate reduced ablaut grade (instead of the normal *i* < I.E. *ə*)[5] or should we rather analyze[6] *r-atna-?*

Study was, on a comparative background, made of various types of suppletive paradigms: *ásita-* "black": fem. *ásiknī-* (probably < **ásitnī-*) with the same—and as such old—suffix as *pát-nī-* "mistress, wife" beside *páti-* "master, husband" (cf. Gr. πότνια "mistress" beside πόσις "husband"): this *-nī-* has been held to denote especially names of animals[7] and of female beings of religious importance.[8] In the Ṛgveda the nom. and acc.

---

which in the cases under consideration are common to both verbal and nominal derivatives of "une valeur aspectuelle" French scholars (see Manessy-Guitton, o.c., p. 11; 158) may create serious misunderstanding.

[1] Cf. also Manessy-Guitton, o.c., p. 121 f.

[2] There is much diversity of opinion: cf. e.g. Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, II, p. 238; Manessy-Guitton, o.c., p. 122 f. See e.g. also Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, II, p. 232.

[3] Cf. Manessy-Guitton, Recherches, p. 109; otherwise Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, II, 2, p. 234; 925.

[4] Cf. Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, II, 2, p. 696.

[5] Cf. H. Hirt, Indogermanische Grammatik, II, Heidelberg 1921, p. 78 f.; B. Ghosh, Linguistic introduction to Sanskrit, Calcutta 1937, p. 33 f. See also chapter II, p. 27.

[6] with O. Szemerényi, in K.Z. 73, p. 181.

[7] Cf. W. Schulze, in Sitzungsberichte Academy Berlin 1910, p. 800 f. (= Kleine Schriften, Göttingen 1933, p. 123); E. Raucq, Contributions à la linguistique des noms d'animaux, Antwerp 1939, p. 62 ff.

[8] P. Chantraine and A. Meillet, in Revue de philologie, 58, p. 292 f.

sing. of the word for "bow" is *dhánus-*, in the other cases we find *dhánvan-* which is also usual as the second member of bahuvrīhi compounds; in the latter position it is retained in later texts but as a single word it is after the Ṛgveda gradually ousted by *dhanus-*, which also serves as a second member of a tatpuruṣa compound.[1]

The *-r-/-n-* stems (nom. acc. sing. *áh-ar*, *áh-aḥ*, gen. sing. *áh-n-as* "day";[2] *yák-ṛ-t*, *yak-ná-s* "liver" were almost unanimously discerned as the remains of an old group of words for rather elementary concepts.[3] Traces of ancient *-r-/-n-* stems were detected e.g. in *vanar-ṣád-* "sitting on trees or in the forest"[4] and *vánan-vant-* "possessing wood"[5] beside *vána-* "forest, tree", of which also some old athematic forms (e.g. loc. plur. *vám-su*) were left. In other cases however the structure of a word is hidden by the ambiguity of the elements or a lack of reliable data: has, for instance, *bhurváṇi-* "restless" anything to do with *bhārvará-* (of uncertain meaning?[6] Since *pívan-*, fem. *pívarī-* "swelling, fat" has its exact counter-part in Gr. πίων; fem. πίειρα *patar-á-* and *patár-u-* "flying" may in consider-ation of Hitt. *pattar*, gen. *paddan-as* "wing" derive from the *-r-* stem **pat-ar-* (*pat-* "to fly"); then *pataṅga-* "bird" may from the historical point of view be analyzed: *pat-aṅ-ga-* and represent the suppletive *-n-* stem. If this explanation[7] be correct, the younger form *pataga-* may be due to reinterpretation: *-ga-*, which is nowadays rather regarded as a suffix, was by way of 'popular etymology' interpreted as the weak root of *-gam-* "to go" (cf. also the later form *pataṅ-ga-ma-*).[8] The element *-ga-* has indeed given rise to some controversial discussion. According to some scholars it belongs to *gam-* in *svar-gá-*, which is usually translated by "heaven" or "celestial", the word originally meaning "going to light, to heaven"; ac-cording to others it is a suffix; however, both opinions do not seem to be mutually exclusive because in some passages the meaning "going to the light of heaven" is undeniable, whereas elsewhere there can be no doubt about the meaning "heaven" or "celestial".[9]

---

[1] Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, III, p. 318.

[2] H. Pedersen, in K.Z. 32 (1893), p. 240 ff.

[3] See e.g. De Saussure, Mémoire, p. 223 ff. (= Recueil, p. 209 ff.).

[4] A. Sharma, in PHMA, 5-6, p. 249 f.

[5] Cf. Geldner, Rig-Veda übersetzt, II, p. 252.

[6] as was supposed by Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 148; see Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, II, p. 481; 509 f.

[7] See Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, II, p. 198 f.; Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, II, 1, p. 544 f. and elsewhere.

[8] If appearances are not deceptive the co-existence of *patangá-* and *pátati* "he flies" gave rise to the younger *plavaṅga-* "monkey, frog" beside *plávate* "he floats, leaps, sways to and fro".

[9] For particulars: Gonda, Loka, Amsterdam Acad. 1966, p. 73 f.

That an exact investigation into the distribution of forms in combination with the observation of particulars concerning sentence phonetics may be fruitful appears for instance from a page devoted to the stem *ātmán-* "self" (also serving as a reflexive pronoun).[1] It is the only fairly common noun in which *-man-* (or *-van-*) follows a consonant preceded by another consonant or a long vowel. By its side occurs *tmán-*, which is not very usual after the Ṛgveda, while the longer form becomes extremely common. In the Ṛgveda these two stems form practically one suppletive paradigm, the strong cases (e.g. sing. nom. and acc.) as a rule deriving from *ātmán-*, the weak ones from *tmán-* (instr. *tmánā* etc.). However, the forms of *tmán-* occur mostly after a short vowel where they are on the strength of a general tendency[2] regular. After a heavy syllable or initially we find the adjectival *tánā* ("one's own") instead of *tmánā*, *táne* (dat.) instead of *tmáne*, which, whatever its exact historical relation to *(ā)tmán-*, may therefore be regarded as a sort of automatic suppletive variant form.[3] A substantially correct view of this relation was long ago expressed by Ludwig,[4] but then the time was not ripe for its acceptance.

The heteroclitic paradigm of the perfect participles *(vid-ván[s]* "knowing", *vid-vā́ṃs-am : vid-vád-bhis)*[5] led scholars to consider the nominative in *-ván[s]* of the adjectives in *-vant-* (*bála-vant-* "strong", nom. sing. *bala-vā́n*), which in view of the Iranian and Greek forms (χαρίεις < *-u̯ent-s) must have been *-vant-s, to be a result of analogy or contamination *(bála-vad-bhis : bála-vā́n).*[6]

On occasion the meanings of those words which have the same formative element are so closely related that the whole group makes the impression of being modelled on one or a few particular forms: it was for instance supposed that the frequent *agriyá-* "foremost" gave, under the influence of *prathamá-* "the first" and other superlatives and ordinals on *-má-*, rise to the synonymous *agrimá-* which in its turn may have produced synonyms and antonyms such as (the younger) *antimá-* "final, ultimate".[7]

---

[1] F. Edgerton, in Language 19 (1943), p. 116 f. maintaining his argument ibid. 29, p. 499 against Renou's (Grammaire védique, p. 231) less exact formulation.

[2] See chapter II, p. 34 f. I refer to Edgerton, o.c., p. 97 f.

[3] Opining that in the Ṛgveda *ātmán-* first and foremost means "breath", and *tmán-* always "self, oneself" H. Willman-Grabowska (in R.O. 7, p. 10 ff.) unconvincingly distinguished two words *ātmán-*, the former belonging to the root *an-* "to breathe", the other being a compound of *ā́* and *tmán-* the origin of which is unknown. For other untenable speculations see Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, I, p. 529. F. B. J. Kuiper, Notes on Vedic noun-inflexion, Amsterdam Acad. 1942, p. 19 f. proposed: *ātmā́* < *$_e$Ht-m-ó and *tmanás* < *Ht-m-$_e$n-ós.

[4] A. Ludwig, Der Rigveda, V, Prag-Leipzig 1883, p. 352 f.

[5] H. Collitz, Die Flexion der Nomina mit dreifacher Stammabstufung ..., in B.B. 10, p. 1 ff.

[6] For a discussion and literature see Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, II, 1, p. 101 ff.

[7] F. Sommer, in Festschrift-H. Jacobi, Bonn 1926, p. 32.

Another formation, in the Veda represented by a few words —e.g. *khanítr-ima-* "produced by digging (of water)"—developed into one of the "systèmes de noms verbaux, substituts de participes"; it is denominative in character and semantically passive.[1] The effects of analogy are clearly discernible in the cases of comparatively small groups of words of similar meaning. An example chosen at random is *-tnu-* which helps to form adjectives of the general meaning of "being active" such as *kr-tnú-* "active", *ji-ga-tnú-* "going quickly"; *tanayitnú-* "thundering".[2] In the cases of *vadhū̆-* "young wife, bride" and *agrū̆-* "unmarried adult woman" the inherited *śvaśrū-* "mother-in-law" may have been the model.

In many cases only a small number of words have, or seem to have, the same formative element in common. Part of these are obscure or capable of different interpretation. For instance, the group *céru-* "worshipping" (?), *maderú-* "intoxicating" (?) etc. was now not distinguished as such from the adjectives in *-ru-*,[3] now explained as a Prākritism,[4] as metanalytically originating in *-ru-* with a preceding *e* (if *ceru-* was to be analyzed as *ce-ru-*, root *ci-*, hence *mad-erú-* etc.),[5] or otherwise.[6]

As to the interesting pseudo-participles of the active perfect (type *kr-ta-vān* "he has made": forms often used as the main verb of a sentence), the comparison with interesting parallels in other languages and definite Tamil forms[7]—which however cannot be considered pan-Dravidian and have only nominal value—does not hold the key to the problem of their origin. This formation which, after an isolated harbinger in AV. 9,6,38 *aśitá-vant-* "having eaten", does not, replacing a verbal form, appear before the grhyasūtras,[8] resulted—in the beginning not as a predicate but in replacement of the active perfect participle which became extinct, and not accompanied by an object—from a combination of the possessive *-vant-* and the verbal adjective in *-ta-*: *bhuk-ta-vant-* "having eaten".[9]

The replacement of root-nouns in *-ā-*, except feminines, by stems ending in *-a-* (e.g. *go-pá* "herdsman" by *go-pa-*) should not be described[10] as an

---

[1] Renou, in Festschrift-M. Winternitz, Leipzig 1933. p. 18 ff.

[2] for which we need not postulate an older **tani-tnu-* (: Lat. *tonitrus* "thunder": M. Leumann, Lateinische Grammatik, München 1928, p. 218).

[3] Whitney, Grammar, p. 452.

[4] Bezzenberger, in B.B. 2, p. 269 f.

[5] B. Ghosh, in B.S.L. 35, p. 15 ff.

[6] Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 14; 162.

[7] Cf. also S. Konow, Saka studies, Oslo 1932, p. 36; 54; 57 and J. Bloch, in B.S.O.S. 5, p. 733.

[8] Renou, in B.S.L. 41, p. 214 ff. It is however known to Pāṇini who (1, 1, 26) couples it with the forms in *-ta-*.

[9] M. Leumann, in Mélanges-H. Pedersen, Copenhagen 1937, p. 115 ff.; Renou, in B.S.L. 41, p. 214 ff.

[10] with Thumb, Handbuch, p. 172 and Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, II, 2, p. 77.

addition of this suffix to the prevocalic weak grade (I.E. ∂, absent before the vowel) of the root, but[1] as metaplasmus: since the stems in -$\bar{a}$- started to become exclusively feminine and the feminine -$\bar{a}$- was commonly correlated with a masculine -a-, the latter gradually replaced -$\bar{a}$- as stem-final of non-feminine root-nouns.

Study was made of the implications of the rule of otherwise identical nominal stems and the tendency of similar (phonetically differentiated) stems[2] (*bhóga*- "enjoyment", *bhojá*- "bountiful") to function as substantives denoting what we might call concepts, entities, actions and other such nominal ideas[3] if they are accented on the root (*yáśas*- "glory, renown"), and as adjectives or agent nouns, if the accent is on the suffix (*yaśás*- "glorious, renowned");[4] of the decline of the root nouns and the growing use and extension of thematic stems; of other mutations in the system, for instance the stems in -r- which were near to the -n- stems but came to join the -i- and -u- stems;[5] (*svásram*, gen. pl. of *svásr*- "sister" becoming *svásrnām*, like *avīnām* from *avi*- "sheep"); of the possibility of I.E. nouns in -*mno*- deriving from prepositions (e.g. Vedic *nimná*- "depth")[6] of retrograde derivatives (*sapátna*- "rival" after *sapátnī*- "fellow-wife");[7] of the type *paitrya*- "relating to the father", which—occurring, it is true, in Old Iranian, but in no other Indo-European language—is in the Ṛgveda a little less frequent than the type *paitra*- "paternal, ancestral", and was held to be a transformation of the latter under the influence of the type *pítrya*- "relating to a father or to the Fathers" which corresponds to Gr. πάτριος and Lat. *patrius*: it is as a rule the younger or youngest form and combines the semantic nuances of the two other formations;[8] of the simultaneous occurrence of stems in -*van*-[9] which is mostly used to form nomina agentis or adjectives characterizing persons and stems in -*vant*- which in the beginning have a preference for the neuter gender, but after the

---

[1] with Hirt, on Thumb, l.c. and Wackernagel-Debrunner, o.c., III, p. 126; Edgerton, in J.A.O.S. 75, p. 60.

[2] Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. 149; III, p. 98 f.

[3] Not generally, with Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 118 "action nouns". I do not see what is the relevance of speculative contentions such as on p. 120: "Logically and presumably historically the neuter action noun precedes the agent noun".

[4] Despite Burrow's optimism (o.c., p. 132 ff.) the question as to why this difference in accent is not a regular feature of the stems in -*an*-, -*man*- etc. has hitherto defied a generally accepted solution. In cases such as *jarás*- "old age" the accent seems to be due to a personalistic view of the idea denoted.

[5] H. Grassmann, in K.Z. 12, p. 243.

[6] B. Forssman, in K.Z. 79, p. 11 f., improving upon Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, II, 2, p. 777 ($<$ *ni-nam*- "to bend or bow down"?).

[7] See e.g. Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, II, p. 202 f.

[8] Debrunner, in I.F. 54, p. 206 ff.

[9] See Wackernagel-Debrunner, o.c., II, 2, p. 893; 903 f.

Ṛgveda are on the increase; of the use of nouns in *-a-* as the last members of compounds (*go-ghn-á-* "slayer of cows"), the nomina agentis in *-tar-* (*hán-tar-*, *han-tár-*) being, in contrast, not capable of occupying that place.[1] The type *vṛdhá-* "furthering" (also occurring as the last member of a compound), though lacking uniformity and as to frequency and regularity ranking below the type *-kará-* "making" (with a strong root vowel), appeared to be associated with the presents of the 6th class (with a weak root vowel): *a-tṛpá-* "not satisfying": *tṛpáti* "he becomes satisfied"; with presents of the 1st class possessing a long vowel, which is as a rule not subject to vowel gradation: *pra-krīḍ-á-* "play": *krīḍati* "he plays"; and— especially at the end of a compound—with athematic root nouns: *vi-mṛdh-á-* "averter of enemies": *mṛdh-* "contemner". In a large majority of cases these nouns are obviously limited to the Indian branch of the I.E. languages.[2] Attention was drawn also to the occurrence of two verbal adjectives of the same root: *ditá-* and *diná-*: *dā-* "to cut"; *dutá-*, *duná* and *dūná-*: *du-* "to burn".[3]

Of onomatopoetic and at the same time reduplicative formations[4] such as *gárgara-* "gurgle, whirlpool"[5] (AV. 4,15,12); *budbuda-* "bubble", it is easily intelligible that they are regardless of their 'antiquity'[6] more frequent in the Atharvaveda than in the Ṛgveda; forms of this type combine also with the verb *kṛ-* "to make": *phát kṛ-* "to produce the sound *phaṭ*" i.e. "to crack".

In contradistinction to nominal stems in *-u-* which, when subjected to secondary derivation, replace *-u-* by *-av-*, stems in *-i-* drop this sound before a suffix beginning with a vowel or with *y*: thus *daivāp-á-* "descendant of Devāpi"; *ādit-yá-* "son of Aditi" as against *mánu-* "man": *mānav-á-* "human; human being". This treatment must be an Indian innovation which was not yet fully developed in the Ṛgveda; it must be understood in connection with the existence of the suffix *-ya-* which "stands to secondary *-a-* in the unique relationship of being, at once, synonymous in large part and homonymous after *i*-stems".[7] Thus one might imagine that *ávy-a-* "coming from the sheep" was re-interpreted as *áv-ya-* and this became the model for derivatives in which the *-i-* was simply dropped.

---

[1] I refer to Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, II, 1, p. 188 f. and II, 2, p. 679 f.

[2] A. Debrunner, in B.S.O.S. 8, p. 487 ff.

[3] K. Hoffmann, in K.Z. 79, p. 177 ff.

[4] Hoffmann, in I.F. 60, p. 254 ff.

[5] which was already by the Indian commentator declared an imitative word. See also H. Lüders, in Z.D.M.G. 96, p. 41.

[6] I doubt whether Hoffmann, p. 255 is right in entertaining the idea that they could be young.

[7] R. Wells, in Language, 29, p. 237 ff.

From a comprehensive comparative study of the presuffixal vowel strengthening in nominal derivatives[1] it emerged that words such as *indrāṇí-* "Indra's wife" had been misunderstood as originating for instance in *-n-* stems:[2] they really are counterparts of Gr. Διώνη ⟨ *Διϝω-νᾱ "wife of Zeus" and Lat. *Bellōna : bellum* "war". This long vowel marks as a rule either an exocentric possessive derivative or, if opposed to a similar adjectival derivative with a short vowel, a substantive: *babhru-ká-* "brownish", but *madhū-ka-* "a bee" (*madhu-* "(anything) sweet, honey, juice of flowers").

That instances of blend (so-called contamination) were not wanting in Vedic times may appear from the form *agnídh-, agnīdh-* "the priest who kindles *(idh-)* the sacred fire", the latter form being according to expectation, the former probably influenced by the frequent *sam-ídh-* "igniting; firewood".[3]

Some formative elements proved to be unreal. Thus an I.E. 'suffix' *-amba- (-umba-)* was with the help of a series of untenable or highly improbable etymologies supposed to exist in *kuṭumba-* "household, family" etc.[4] Like other etymologically difficult groups such as *úlapa-* "brush, shrub", *kúṇapa-* "dead body", *sarṣápa-* "mustard"[5] and other words in *-(a)pa-*,[6] part of which were tentatively explained as Dravidian,[7] these words are however more likely to have been borrowed from the substratum.

In the case of more or less isolated words it may be problematic whether we have to do with a derivative or a compound. Thus *dámū-nas-* "householder, master" was, most unconvincingly, it is true, held to have sprung from **dámū naḥ* "(who is) in our house"[8] (Zusammenrückung: *sá dámū nas* "he in our house" ⟩ *sá dámūnās;* Gr. ἔνδοξος (ἐν δόξῃ) "held in esteem" is not however a perfect parallel case) or from *dám-ū-nas-* (*ū* being the weak root of *áv-ati* "he favours", cf. *ū-tí-* "help") the original meaning being "who favours (or is favoured in) a house",[9] but also, with much more probability, analyzed as **damū-* (⟨ I.E. *domū-*) and the suffix *-no-*

---

[1] W. Meid, in I.F. 62, p. 260 ff.
[2] E. Leumann, in K.Z. 32, p. 294 f.
[3] Debrunner, in I.L. 16, p. 74 ff.
[4] H. Petersson, in I.F. 34 (1914/15), p. 222 ff.
[5] For a bibliography see Wüst, PHMA, 2 (1956), p. 59 ff. Wüst o.c. and Thieme, in Z.D.M.G. 111, p. 106 ff. try to prove the I.E. origin of this word.
[6] Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, II, 2, p. 212 f.
[7] Cf. also B. Ghosh, Les formations en *p* du sanscrit, Paris 1933, p. 54 ff., who is right in observing that in none of the instances quoted the suffixal character of the syllable *pa* is certain. For *-p-* in verbs: J. Charpentier, in I.F. 25, p. 243 ff., and much more probably, M. Leumann, in I.F. 57, p. 226 f.
[8] Chr. Bartholomae, in B.B. 15, p. 194 ff.
[9] V. Pisani, in K.Z. 72, p. 213 ff.

with an -s- extension, so as to join the group of words in -nes-/-nos-,[1] which relate to property: *áp-nas-* "property"; *rék-nas-* "inherited possession" etc. ; most of these cannot however be regarded as inherited from original Indo-European.

The controversial adjectives in -*añc*- may be instanced for the occasional transition of composition to derivation. Those adjectives in -*añc*- ——according to some[2] representing the root *añc*- "to move, go",[3] according to others[4] an I.E. suffix *enk^u*- more than once considered identical with that root—which have three stems —e.g. *praty-áñc-*: *praty-ák-* (which in the oldest texts occurs only in the neuter with the ending zero): *pratīc-* "turned towards etc." —have long been regarded as 'heteroclitic', the third stem formed either with a -*k*- suffix[5] or with a stem for "eye" or "seeing"[6] (I.E. *ok^u*-) until an attempt was made to explain the third stem as a product of analogy:[7] gen. sing. *$proti-ṅk^u-o-s$* ⟩ *pratiñcas* ⟩ *pratīcás*, because the absence of an *n* was characteristic of the weak stems, the long vowel being due to the corresponding forms of e.g. *párāñc-* "turned away", viz. *párācas*. The older view of the third stem was however upheld in an ingenious reconsideration of the complete material the authoress[8] of which was obviously unacquainted with the above hypothesis.

Besides the grammars there appeared in the course of the XIXth century some valuable monographs on Old Indian noun inflection.[9] After Böthlingk[10] who, noticeably influenced by the indigenous grammarians, made an exposition of the main facts, Lanman[11] furnished the students of the Veda with a useful statistical account of all declensional forms. Most contributions were, however, comparative in nature, trying to elucidate the prehistory of the Indian forms.[12] Some of the relative prob-

---

[1] Somewhat otherwise: Meid, Personalia mit -*no*- Suffix, (unpublished) thesis Tübingen 1955, p. 212 ff.; the same, in I.F. 63, p. 151 f.; Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, II, 2, p. 738 (cf. p. 499); Manessy, Les substantives en -*as*-, p. 103 f.; the same, in I.I.J. 8, p. 171 ff.; for the suffix -*nas*- Meillet, in M.S.L. 15, p. 254 ff. See p. 47, n. 6.

[2] e.g. Whitney, Grammar, p. 152; Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, III, p. 230.

[3] For the three roots *añc*- see F. B. J. Kuiper, in Vāk, 2 (Poona 1952), p. 36 ff.

[4] e.g. Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, I, 2, p. 94 ff.

[5] H. Osthoff, Morphologische Untersuchungen, IV, Leipzig 1881, p. 249 ff.

[6] J. Schmidt, Pluralbildungen, p. 396 f. and others.

[7] W. Morgenroth, in Wiss. Zeitschrift Univ. Greifswald, 9, p. 435 ff. and in Archiv Orientální, 29 (1961), p. 575 ff.

[8] J. Manessy-Guitton, Les 'dérivés' sanscrits en -*āc*-, -*īc*-, -*ūc*-, in Proceedings IXth Int. Congress of linguists (Cambridge Mass. 1962), The Hague 1964, p. 818 ff.

[9] For nominal declension in Vedic and Sanskrit see E. A. Makaev, in Voprosy jazykoznanija, Moscow 1964, 6, p. 94 ff.

[10] O. Böhtlingk, Die Declination im Sanskrit, Petersburg Acad. 6, 7 (1843), p. 115 ff.

[11] Ch. R. Lanman, in J.A.O.S. 10 (1878).

[12] Cf. e.g. F. Graefe, Die Einheit der Sanskrit-Declination mit der griechischen und lateinischen, Petrograd Acad. 6, 6 (1843), p. 233 ff.; A. Dutens, Essai sur l'origine des exposants casuels en sanscrit, Paris 1883.

lems, though recognized at an early date, continue to provoke controversies. The nominative-accusative plural neuter is a case in point. There are in the Veda neuter forms which syntactically can function as singulars as well as plurals, e.g. *údhar divyáni* "celestial udders"; most scholars are —rightly, I think—inclined to regard this feature as a survival from an early stage when the inflectional system was less developed.[1] Besides, Vedic has retained some forms in -*ā*, which cannot be explained as due to metrical lengthening, of neutral -*n*- stems, e.g. *bhū́mā* "beings".[2] Occurring also in Avestan this -*ā* must have been Indo-Iranian;[3] about its origin we grope in the dark although there is much to be said for the supposition that it represents the suffix *(-an-)* in the lengthened grade[4] (cf. *rā́jā[n]* "king", nom. sing.). The evidence of the Avesta indicates that there was in the Indo-Iranian period a longer form of the type *nā́māni* "names" which was already in the Ṛgveda more common. The *i* has remained controversial, the in my opinion less probable explanation considering it identical with the -*i*- which appears in the formation of neuter nouns such as *ásth-i* "bone";[5] a more acceptable solution is to identify it with the Gr. etc. ending -*a* ($<$ I.E. -*ə*), representing the weak grade of the I.E. ending -*ā* which occurs e.g. in Ved. *yugā́* "yokes"[6] and which in prehistoric times must have formed expressions for masses or collectivities; hence the occasional construction with a verb in the singular, which is well known from Greek. It is on the other hand generally admitted that, on the analogy of the type *nā́māni*, a new type of neuter plural characterized by an *n* was created for -*a*-, -*i*- and -*u*- stems: *bhúvanāni* "worlds", *vásūni* "riches", which in the Veda occurs in competition with the older forms.[7] This is not the only case in which the -*n*- declination exerted influence upon other stems.

No complete agreement has hitherto been reached on the double inflection of the polysyllabic feminine stems in -*ī*-, the so-called *devī́*- "goddess" type inflecting: nom. sing. *devī́*, acc. *devī́m*, abl. gen. *devyā́s*, nom. pl. *devī́s*—a paradigm which is gaining ground—, and the *vṛkī́*- "she-

---

[1] G. H. M. Mahlow, Die langen Vokale *a e o*, Berlin 1879, p. 72 ff.; Delbrück, Altindische Syntax, p. 80; J. Schmidt, Die Pluralbildungen der indogermanischen Neutra, Weimar 1889, p. 276 ff.; Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, III, p. 65.

[2] Schmidt, o.c., p. 277 ff.; Wackernagel-Debrunner, o.c., p. 276 f.

[3] Macdonell, Vedic grammar, p. 203.

[4] Brugmann, Grundriss, II, 2, p. 235.

[5] Schmidt, in K.Z. 26, p. 16, and o.c., p. 227 ff.; Hirt, Indogerm. Grammatik, III, p. 57 f.; Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 236; rejected by Brugmann, Morphologische Untersuchungen, V, Leipzig 1890, p. 52 ff.

[6] W. Streitberg, in I.F. 3, p. 376 f.; Meillet, in M.S.L. 13, p. 204 ff. Other views should not detain us here; see Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, III, p. 63.

[7] J. Hanusz, in Sitzungsberichte Akad. Wien, 110 (Vienna 1886), p. 59 ff.

wolf" type: nom. sing. *vṛkī́-s*, and *vṛkyàm*, *vṛkyàs*, *vṛkyàs*. The former type corresponds to the -*i̯ā́*-/-*i̯ə̄*- nouns in other languages (Gr. ἡδεῖα ‹ *σϝᾱδεϝ-ίᾰ "sweet": ἡδείας ‹ *σϝᾱδεϝ-ι̯ᾱ-ς), the latter seems to belong to a group of rare -*ī*- stems of obscure origin,[1] an alternative view being held by those who regard it as a younger class—it is foreign to Old Iranian—arisen under the influence of the compounds—for reasons of accentuation not of the non-composed forms—of root nouns in -*ī*- (type *dhī́*- "vision, inspired thought": *dhī́-s*, *dhíy-am*, *dhiy-ás* etc.,[2] i.e. of words such as *nānā-dhī́*- "of different vision", which however are comparatively infrequent and semantically unrelated to the nouns of the *vṛkī́*-class; it is moreover incomprehensible[3] why this analogy should not have spread also to the numerous and frequently used feminines in -*ī*- beside stems in -*an*-, -*ant*-, -*añc*-, -*tar*- etc. There is no need to dwell on other complications caused by the co-existence of -*ī*- and -*i*- stems etc. (R̥V. *rā́trīm*, acc. "night": AV. *rā́trim*),[4] and on the feminines of the adjectives in -*i*- and -*u*-.[5]

The history of the case endings is largely the domain of the comparative linguist. Of the three types of locative singular, illustrated by the alternative forms *akṣán*, *akṣáṇ-i*, *akṣṇ-í* "eye" the first, which is losing ground, is often—and probably—considered the oldest;[6] the -*i* of the longer forms seems to have been a particle extending the endless form.[7]

The irregular instr. sing. *mahiná* (*mahimán*- "greatness") was often explained as a product of analogy (*mn* › *n* after a vowel), the starting-point being the instr. *drāghmá* "length" ‹ *drā-gh-mn-ä́* (*mn* › *m* after a consonant), which, like most remaining words involved (*variṇá* "with extent" etc.[8] belongs to the same semantic fields;[9] it may in its turn have

---

[1] Cf. H. Lommel, Studien über indogermanische Femininbildungen, Thesis Göttingen 1912, p. 71; cf. Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, III, p. 170 f.

[2] After others R. Norton Albright, The Vedic declension of the type *vṛkís*, Philadelphia 1927, who, while failing to prove that the *vṛkī́*- forms occur only in definite metric positions or are as a rule prosodically preferable to *devī́*- forms, sets too much value on poetic licence; the mere fact that definite forms are protected by the metre does not moreover settle the question whether the poets were, for metrical convenience, using new (analogical) creations or retaining inherited forms. There is no space here to polemize with Burrow, Sanskrit language p. 253 on the prehistory of some of the case-forms of the *devī́*-type, or to discuss the views pronounced by J. Kuryłowicz, The inflectional categories of Indo-European, Heidelberg 1964, p. 215 ff.

[3] Cf. Wackernagel, in I.F. 46, p. 351.

[4] Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, III, p. 185.

[5] F. Sommer, in I.F. 36, p. 165 ff.

[6] On the endingless locatives e.g. J. Schmidt, in K.Z. 27, p. 306 ff.

[7] See e.g. Brugmann, Grundriss, II, 2, p. 179.

[8] For similar developments in semantic congeneric classes of words see M. Bloomfield, in A.J.P. 12, p. 1 ff.

[9] H. Collitz, in B.B. 18, p. 231 ff.; Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 60.

given rise to *bhūná* (*bhūman-* "abundance") etc.; one should not however rule out the possibility of dissimilation and the influence of metrical convenience.[1]

The case forms of the thematic stems[2] constitute as early as the Ṛgveda 45% of all nominal forms. As is well known -*a*- forms primary and secondary derivatives of various types and in many combinations. Its peculiar endings—which in part recur in the generic pronouns[3] where they are supposed to have been original—did not fail to attract early attention. Of these the ending -*ena* of the non-personal pronouns, which in the oldest texts occurs beside -*ā* in the sing. instr. of the thematic stems to become usual in Vedic prose, poses a hard question inducing some scholars to assume a euphonic *n*, shortening of the *ā* and other phonetic irregularities,[4] others to ascribe its origin to the pronominal instrumental *enā́*, *enā*,[5] to suppose the existence of a pronominal form **toinā̆* (stem *to-* + *i* as in O.I. *teṣu*, Gr. τοῖσι, and ending -*nā̆*)[6] or a prehistoric **tanā̆* (stem *ta-* and ending -*nā̆*) blended with the plural form *tebhis*,[7] (the latter supposition seems plausible) and combinations of, or variations on, these hypotheses,[8] none of which carries complete conviction. Much has been written on the dative in -*āya* (*devā́ya* "to the god") which, beside the more original -*āi* (cf. Gr. ἵππῳ "to the horse"), is also found in the Avesta; the final *a* can hardly originate in a postpositive particle[9] for which in the dative no parallel instances can be quoted. Nor can in my opinion the well-known tendency of flectional forms to conform to a prevailing rhythmical scheme[10] furnish the explanation: there is only the genitive in -*asya*.

Many other discussions of case endings must be passed over without comment: questions such as the origin of the ending -*āya* in the dat. sing.

---

[1] Bloomfield, in B.B. 23, p. 105 ff.

[2] For some remarks on this very productive but secondary class of words see Meillet, in B.S.L. 32, p. 194 ff.

[3] A. Ludwig, Die Entstehung der *a*- Deklination und die Zurückführung ihrer Elemente auf das ihr zu Grunde liegende Pronomen, Sitzungsberichte Wiener Akademie, 55 (1867), p. 131 ff.; a publication by F. G. Aleksandrov on the same subject, Odessa 1922 seems to be inaccessible.

[4] F. Bopp, Vergleichende Grammatik, I, Berlin 1833, p. 188; Benfey, Grammatik, p. 297.

[5] J. Schmidt, in K.Z. 27 (1885), p. 292 f. and others.

[6] K. F. Johansson, in B.B. 16 (1890), p. 153 ff. and others.

[7] Meillet, in M.S.L. 9 (1896), p. 370.

[8] e.g. Kuiper, in A.O. 16 (1938), p. 215 ff.; Specht, o.c., p. 374, and especially C. Hauri, in a from the philological point of view uncritical publication Zur Vorgeschichte des Ausgangs -*ena* des Instr. Sing. der *a*-Stämme des Altindischen, Göttingen 1963 (see p. 14 -*ena* < *enā* under the influence of -*ebhis* < -*anā̆* which was a pronominal ending (cf. Vedic *anā́* "thus") representing the ending -*nā̆* and a preceding thematic -*a*-). See also Kuiper, in I.I.J. 8, p. 67 ff.

[9] Thus Bartholomae, Arische Forschungen, II, Halle 1886, p. 169 and others.

[10] Thus Wackernagel, in K.Z. 43, p. 290.

áśvāya "to the horse" as against Gr. ἵππῳ, Lat. *equō[i]*[1] or the prehistoric relations of the endings beginning with *bh*—the *s* in two of which, *-bhis* and *-bhyas*, has often been interpreted as characterizing the plural as against the indifferent Gr. -φι[2]—pertain first and foremost to the Indo-europeanist, although it will interest the Sanskrit scholar to know that the instr. in *-e-bhis* (e.g. *aśve-bhis* "with horses") which in the Ṛgveda are almost as frequent as those in *-ais* and which occur also in Old Iranian must have been an innovation—it originally belonged to the pronouns, hence its special preference for adjectives[3]—and an addition to the wealth of forms in the oldest language which[4] does not appear in Vedic prose and classical Sanskrit.

The Vedic vocative is unaccented, except when it appears before a sentence, and then it has an accent of its own on the first syllable, regardless of the normal position of the accent in the word.[5] This must be a normalization of a phenomenon which is, though far from regular, not unknown to other languages (Greek πάτερ "O father": πατήρ) and has been ascribed to the occurrence of these forms in the above position or to enclisis;[6] more probably it is due to a shift of the accent in calling or addressing a person emphatically.

In addition to the well-known case forms with an ending zero the Vedic language exhibits also forms which are without their normal ending. These are not remains of a flexionless period but partly due to haplology (e.g. ṚV. 1,105,5 *triṣv ā́ rocané* "in the three luminous spheres"), to the exigencies of the versification, poetical tradition and so on; in some cases they may be ascribed to a more evolved dialect.[7] Although their occurrence was signalized at an early date[8] and it was shown that definite endings *(-su* and those beginning with *-bh: iṣṭé* instead of *iṣṭébhis*) were specially liable to be suppressed,[9] this phenomenon gave rise to much discus-

---

[1] I refer to Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, II, 2, p. 32 f. The interpretation *áśvāya* < *aśva-ā-ayya-* "horse-to-going" > "(going) to the horse"; *-ā-* preverb as well as postposition, *-ayya-* gerundive of *-i-* "to go", proposed by M. Walleser, in Ehrengabe-W. Geiger, Leipzig 1931, p. 167 ff. who knowingly leaves the other dative endings in Old Indian and other languages out of account and omits to found his suggestion on fact must be relegated to the limbo of failures.

[2] H. Grassmann, in K.Z. 12, p. 261; Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 238.

[3] See e.g. Mahlow, o.c., p. 100; Meillet, in J.A. 1910, 2, p. 185.

[4] as already stated in chapter I, p. 17.

[5] For particulars Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, III, p. 27 f.

[6] e.g. H. Hirt, Der indogermanische Akzent, Strassburg 1895, p. 296.

[7] Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, III, p. 78; Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 83 (one should avoid the term syncope).

[8] A. Ludwig, Der Infinitiv im Rigveda, Prague 1871, p. 5 ff. (see also Renou, Maîtres, p. 19).

[9] Bartholomae, in K.Z. 29, p. 583 f., arguing, *inter alia*, that the simultaneous existence of *dáme (ā́)* "in the house" and *dámeṣu* "in the houses" must have led to the facultative

sion which gradually led to greater reserve about the extent of this absence of endings. Most scholars are now inclined to regard the type *návyasā vácas* (instead of *vácasā*) "with new words" (absence of the ending in the second member of the group), especially if it occurs at the end of a pāda, as practically indubitable, but try —not rarely on sufficient grounds— to explain other cases as apposition, adverbial use (*vadhánābhir apratí* not "with irresistible weapons" but "irresistibly with weapons"), substantivation of an adjective (*mahátsv ājíṣu ... árbhe* "in great combats and in something unimportant") etc.[1]

Passing mention may be made of the gerunds or absolutives in *-tvā* (e.g. *ha-tvá* "having killed") which are rare in the oldest texts, and those in *-tvī* (*kr̥-tvī́* "having done"), which, while more frequent in the R̥gveda, were soon to go out of use. The former are[2] mostly explained as petrified instrumentals of *-tu-* stems, the latter sometimes as a blend of *-tvā* with **-tī* which may have helped to form instrumentals of *-ti-* stems. There is no reason for rejecting the former explanation on the gratuitous assumption that the formation of both elements "must run on parallel lines".[3]

The so-called *cvi* forms denoting "becoming..., making..." (*mithunī́ bhavanti* "they cohabit"; *mithunī́ károti* "he causes to pair") and "coming into possession etc. of" are—not unanimously,[4] it is true—explained[5] as originally adverblike elements which are genetically identical with Latin forms in *-ī* such as *lucrī facere* "to make something an object of profit, to gain".

The problem as to whether the extraordinary development of those nominal forms which are usually but incorrectly called infinitives[6]—they really are case forms of nouns which, in view of their syntactic use, are translatable by infinitives—did not stimulate definite suffixes into a formal and functional expansion was answered in the affirmative.[7] Yet part of the forms may suggest doubts about their real character; are *stu-ṣ-é* "to praise" etc. 'infinitives' or personal forms, and if the latter

---

character of the ending *-su*.

[1] For particulars see Wackernagel-Debrunner, l.c.; Renou, in B.S.L. 61, p. 6.

[2] Since F. Bopp, Über das Conjugationssystem der Sanskritsprache, Frankfurt M. 1816, p. 43 ff.

[3] Thus Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 171.

[4] See also J. Kuryłowicz, in Festschrift-A. Debrunner, Bern 1954, p. 255.

[5] Wackernagel, in Mélanges-F. de Saussure, Paris 1908, p. 125 ff. (= Kleine Schriften, p. 1346 ff.). Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 323 erroneously regards these forms as post-Vedic.

[6] F. Wolff, Die Infinitive des Indischen und Iranischen, Thesis Giessen 1905 (a partly antiquated attempt at distinguishing between finite forms or substantives and 'infinitives' on the strength of formal and syntactic criteria); P. Sgall, Die Infinitive im R̥gveda, Acta Univ. Carolinae, Phil. 2, Prague 1958, p. 135 ff.

[7] Renou, in B.S.L. 38, p. 69 ff.

supposition be right, did they arise from 'infinitives'?[1] The so-called in-
finitives—of which there are, apart from two dubious formations, no less
than 16 types—tend to differentiate from the corresponding nominal case
forms.[2] Thus, beside the datives in -*e* of root nouns there are supines[3] in
-*ai;* beside -*tave* there is a secondary -*tavai;* there is a difference in accent
(e.g. *jīv-ás-e* "in order to live" as against *áp-as-e*, dat. of *ápas-* "work");
a striking syntactic characteristic is the 'double dative' which cannot be
dealt with in this chapter. As to the curious double-accented type *gántavaí*
it was suggested[4] to analyze it as an ancient case form of the class under
consideration and a particle which might be identical with Gr. -αι in -εναι,
-μεναι (e.g. ἐλθέμεναι "(to) come"). There are indications that part of the
so-called infinitives may be described as individual innovations or adap-
tations. Thus the controversial group of forms in -*tári* or -*tárī*[5] are mainly
found in more or less esoterical passages of the Ṛgveda.

Although the interest of the absolutive or 'gerund' in -*am* lies mainly
in its syntax, it may be recalled that this formation, which derives im-
mediately from a strong and accented root preceded by a preverb or a
nominal element and is translatable as a present participle, was considered
identical with the so-called infinitive in -*am* which, after the Ṛgveda,
rapidly fell into disuse: cf. ṚV. 7,86,3 the 'infinite' *úpo emi... vi-pṛch-am*
"I go to... in order to ask", or "... asking"[6] and 8,2,18 the 'gerund' *yánti
pra-mád-am* "they go while being intoxicated".

It has been supposed that the gerundives of the type *deya-* "to be given"
etc. which became more frequent in the Atharvaveda, were, historically
speaking, analyzable as *de-* (ṚV. 5,41,1) (a so-called dative root infinitive)
and the suffix -*ya-*;[7] similarly, notwithstanding some difficulties, *yudhénya*
"to be fought with": *yudh-é* "fight" (dat.). The gerundives in -*tva-* no
doubt belong to the stems in -*tu-* which have furnished several so-called
infinitives *(-tave, -tavai, -tos, -tum);* those in -*anīya-* can best be explained
as deriving from the nouns in -*ana-*[8] which have a predilection for the
syntactic function under consideration. There is moreover no reason for
serious doubt about the supposition that the adjectives in -*(s)áni-, -táni,*

---

[1] Oldenberg, in Z.D.M.G. 55, p. 307; 59, p. 355; Renou, Introduction générale, p. 53, n. 71 and in B.S.L. 61, p. 3 f.
[2] Renou, in Festschrift-Debrunner, Bern 1954, p. 383 ff.
[3] This term is less objectionable.
[4] Meillet, in B.S.L. 32, p. 192 f.
[5] Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, II, p. 673 and III, p. 205; Renou, in B.S.L. 61, p. 4.
[6] Renou, in M.S.L. 23, p. 359 ff.
[7] Bartholomae, in K.Z. 41, p. 319 ff.; Renou, in B.S.L. 38, p. 68 ff.
[8] Macdonell, Vedic grammar, p. 407.

-váni (e.g. *ru-ruk-ṣ-áṇi-* "wishing or able to destroy": *ruj-* "to break, injure") have the same origin (cf. forms such as *pū-pu-tani* "to be cleaned").[1] The limited number of forms in *-tári*[2] of disputed origin (locatives?, nominatives?), which are often classified as infinitives (e.g. *dhar-tári: dhr-* "to hold") are ambiguous in form and function so as to form a problem which has defied solution.

Many important publications have been devoted to nominal compounds,[3] and in this section of grammatical description the ancient Indians had again paved the way for their modern successors. To them we owe *inter alia* the recognition of the main classes of compounds[4] and of many particulars concerning their formation. The most comprehensive survey was written by Wackernagel,[5] but after him many scholars contributed their mite.

In the oldest Veda the use made of nominal composition is much more restricted than in the classical language. In many respects it is comparable to Homeric Greek: the compounds generally consist of no more than two members and often are more or less distinctly different in meaning from the corresponding word group: in the ritual *viṣṇu-krama-* is a technical term for the three "steps of Viṣṇu" to be taken by the sacrificer, not a name of the steps of the god himself;[6] a *kṛṣṇa-śakuní-* is a "crow" or "raven", not any black bird. In the Ṛgveda—which is far from availing itself of all possibilities realized in later texts—the devatādvandvas (those expressing names of deities) are predominant among the dvandvas, the verbal tatpuruṣas (type *havir-ád-* "eating the oblation") among the determinative compounds.[7] In the brāhmaṇas the number of compounds only a little increased, technical and abstract compounds becoming conspicuous.[8] The scholarly and technical style of the sūtras contributed much

---

[1] Renou, in B.S.L. 38, p. 73 ff., plausibly defending the thesis that these forms and those in *-tári*- are survivals of the *-r/n-* nouns.

[2] Sgall, o.c., p. 158; Renou, in B.S.L. 61, p. 4.

[3] Two recent publications, the unsatisfactory "vaguely structuralist" (p. 12 f.) book by R. Harweg, Kompositum und Katalysationstext vornehmlich im späten Sanskrit, The Hague 1964 and an article by J. F. Staal, in I.I.J. 9, p. 165 ff., which starting from generative principles and using Sanskrit examples deals with the formation of compounds in general, may be mentioned in the interest of those who like discussions of principles apropos of elementary facts.

[4] V. I. Kalyanov, Classification of the compound words in Sanskrit, Izvestiya Akad. Nauk U.S.S.R. 6, p. 77 ff.

[5] Wackernagel, Grammatik, II, 1 (1905).

[6] Delbrück, Vergleichende Syntax, III, p. 204 ff., who, exaggerating and generalizing this difference in Altindische Syntax, p. 62 f. elicited W. D. Whitney's justified criticism (A.J.P. 13, p. 282 f.).

[7] Renou, in Language, 29, p. 231 ff.; the same, in B.S.L. 52, p. 96 ff.

[8] H. Willman-Grabowska, Les composés nominaux dans le Śatapathabrāhmaṇa, 2 vol., Krakow 1928; Renou, ibidem.

to their spread. Analogy and the influence of words of similar sound or identical structure played an important part in this process, second members in -*rūpa*- "form", -*loka*- "world", -*jyotis*- "light" being, in connection with the contents of these texts, very frequent. There appear a few derivatives from compounds, especially from "divine" dvandvas (e.g. *aindrāgná*- "sacred etc. to Indra and Agni") but descriptive bahuvrīhis are in this genre of literature not much liked.

The origin of the type *mātá̄-pitárau* "father and mother i.e. parents" (instead of which also *mātárā-pitárā*; the Northerners said *mātara-pitarau*; Pāṇini, 6,3,32) is not beyond controversy: have we to assume haplology (< *mātárā-pitárau*),[1] or an originally asyndetic combination of nominatives? There is in general some disagreement about the age and origin of those dvandvas—or rather associations of accented nouns—in which each member is dual in form (e.g. *mitrávárunā*), especially in connection with the question as to how far the type *mitrá́ várunaś ca* (with a 'tautological' singular after the elliptic dual *mitrá́* "Mitra and Varuṇa") was already usual in the parent language.[2] We should hesitate to be too positive on this point.[3]

The type of compound in which the first member has a case-ending and, very often, an accent of its own, i.e. the so-called improper[4] compounds (e.g. *vánas-páti*- "lord of the wood, i.e. tree")[5] has incorrectly been regarded as new;[6] most scholars are on the contrary convinced of the antiquity of this formation.[7]

Attention was rightly paid[8] to the fact that adjectival compounds the latter member of which is not a substantive may be classified according to the various types of stem which appear in the second member: *go-ghná*- "killing cows" (thematic suffix); *uktha-śaṃsín*- "singing hymns" (suffix

[1] Cf. S. Konow, in Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap, 7 (1934), p. 14.
[2] as is affirmed by F. Edgerton, in K.Z. 43, p. 110 ff., who hardly hits the mark in supposing the elliptic dual to have arisen from obvious analogy with the duals of the personal pronouns and in arguing that finally all dvandva compounds of Old Indian had their starting-point in the type *mitrá́-várunau* which owed its existence to the tendency to compensate for the obscurity of the elliptic dual. See also E. Sittig, in K.Z. 59, p. 61: *mitrá́-várunā* < *mitrá́ várunaś ca*. See also ch. V, p. 121f.
[3] notwithstanding the publications quoted by Schwyzer-Debrunner, II, p. 151 f. Compare also the notes in Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, II, 1, Nachträge, p. 45 ff.
[4] To use an arithmetical term.
[5] For a survey, characterisation and classification: O. Richter, in I.F. 9 (1898), p. 1 ff., whose thesis that adjectival compounds of the type *agnim-indhá*- "kindling the fire" are condensed subordinate clauses (p. 188) is no longer tenable.
[6] Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 211, suggesting that only the genitive ending occurs in this way; in saying that this ending is retained he contradicts himself (p. 208; 210: the first member originally took no inflections for case etc.). See also Richter, o.c., p. 193.
[7] Schwyzer, o.c., I, p. 445.
[8] e.g. by Burrow, o.c., p. 211 ff. See also Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 120 ff.

-*in*-)[1] etc.; very often the second member does not appear in independent use. Here also thematic stems won much ground.

The extremely frequent negative compounds formed with prefix *a*- engaged the attention of many scholars:[2] remarks were made on their form,[3] character, use and origin,[4] and it was argued that these compounds tend to become semantically autonomous:[5] *a-vṛká-* lit. the negation of "wolf" 〉 "inoffensive, protecting against enemies; qui ne laisse pas place à une agression".

The origin of the bahuvrīhi compounds has been much disputed. Jacobi's[6] view according to which they originated in contracted subordinate clauses ("versteinerte beziehungswortlose Nebensätze mit dem Begriff des Besitzes") is not only "unnecessary"[7] but untenable because fully developed subordinate clauses must have been a comparatively late occurrence. Although the still older explication as "mutierte karmadhārayakomposita"[8]—i.e. as a product of mechanical conversion to adjectives with added possessive value—could not carry general conviction, it seems in consideration of the fact that this class of compounds was, also in other languages, in great demand to denote persons (or objects) after a conspicuous characteristic so as to become epithets, nicknames or simply names— cf. *nī́la-pṛṣṭha-* "black-backed"; *vájra-hasta-* "vajra-handed", i.e. "wielding the vajra (Indra etc.)"—probable that they were like single words of the same semantic classes—that is, denoting bodily or psychical features— applied to men and gods;[9] and that irrespective as to whether a karmadhāraya counterpart was usual: as far as appears from our sources bahuvrīhis were in olden times much more common.

So-called Zusammenrückungen were not left out of consideration: *dvā-pára-* "the third best cast" (in ancient Indian 'dice'-playing) is more convincingly explained as originating in the phrase **dvā́ párau* "two are exceeding, better"[10] than as based on the adverb *dvi-pari* "except two".[11]

---

[1] Willman-Grabowska, o.c., p. 248 f.

[2] I refer also to Hj. Frisk, Über den Gebrauch des Privativpräfixes im indogerm. Adjektiv, in Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift 47 (1941), 11, and the same, Substantiva privativa im Indogermanischen, ibidem, 53 (1947), 3.

[3] J. Puhvel, Indo-European negative composition, in Language, 29, p. 14 ff.

[4] Gonda, Four studies, ch. III.

[5] Renou, in B.S.O.S. 10, p. 1 ff.

[6] H. Jacobi, Compositum und Nebensatz, Bonn 1897, p. 83 ff.

[7] Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, II, 2, p. 411.

[8] L. von Schroeder, in K.Z. 24 (1879), p. 102; Brugmann, Grundriss, II (¹1892), p. 87 f.

[9] Gonda, Epithets in the Ṛgveda, The Hague 1959, p. 20 ff.

[10] Lüders, in G.G.A., 9, 2 (1907), p. 70 (= Philologica indica, p. 169); cf. Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, III, p. 342.

[11] V. Pisani, in Rivista degli Studi Orientali, 20, p. 161 f.; Z.D.M.G. 97, p. 325.

Study was made of the accentuation[1] of compounds; of the internal sandhi;[2] of the rule already formulated by Pāṇini (2,2,34): if a dvandva consists of two members of an unequal number of syllables, the shorter member precedes: *darśa-pūrṇamāsau* should therefore be translated "the sacrifices of full- and of new-moon", and *mitrā́váruṇau* "Varuṇa (who is the most important of the two) and Mitra";[3] and, already at a very early date,[4] of those compounds in which the first member is an interrogative (-indefinite) pronoun:[5] *ku-cará-* "roaming about"; *kú̄-yava-* "causing a bad harvest"; *kiṃ-púruṣa-* "a mongrel being" or "mock-man" (or something to that effect), some scepticism being justified about the absolute correctness of the view of their origin as counterparts of exclamations of surprise emphasizing the extraordinary character of a figure or appearance (like the German "was für ein Mensch");[6] the Indian interpretation ("slightly..., a little..., badly...,") deserves attention.

The type represented by Gr. ἀρχέ-κακος "beginning mischief", in which the first member governs the second, though not completely unknown to the Veda (*śikṣā-nará-* "practising heroism"(?)), was—obviously for clarity's sake[7]—replaced[8] by compounds such as *kṣayád-vīra-* "ruling men" which is also found in Iranian.[9] Although the participles in *-at- (-ant-)* or, more probably, injunctives seem to have been the source of this group, it must as a whole be regarded as due to analogy: the accent is different (*kṣáyat-* in the participle); the only forms in use correspond to participles of the Ist and VIth classes; the majority of forms are characterized by the same rhythm and an internal combination *dv*.

As to the so-called *āmreḍitas* ("reiteration"),[10] e.g. *gṛhé-gṛhe* "in every house"[11]—which, though dealt with as such, were not described as compounds by Pāṇini and other Indian authorities—these expressions of "repetition" may have an iterative as well as distributive function which

---

[1] J. N. Reuter, in K.Z. 31, p. 157 ff.; 485 ff.; C. R. Sankaran, in Journal of Oriental Research (Madras), vol. 8-10 (8, 135 ff. etc.) and elsewhere (rather speculatively).

[2] Wackernagel, Dehnungsgesetz, in Programm Univ. Basel 1889, p. 24 ff. (= Kleine Schriften, p. 920 ff.); Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 122.

[3] W. Caland, in A.O. 9, p. 59 ff.

[4] G. H. F. Nesselmann, in Zs. f. d. Kunde des Morgenlandes, 2 (1839), p. 93 ff.

[5] There is no reason for doubting this association in the case of *ku-* (compare *kú-tra* "where etc." and the similar use of *kad-* etc.) and for taking it to be the stem of a *u-* adjective (thus Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 182).

[6] Wackernagel, Grammatik, II, 1, p. 82 ff.; E. Schwyzer, in Z.I.I. 7, p. 111 ff.; K. Brugmann, in I.F. 39, p. 114; Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, I, 2, p. 410.

[7] Wackernagel, Grammatik, II, 1, p. 319.

[8] Cf. Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 139.

[9] Renou, in B.S.L. 41, p. 217 ff.

[10] H. Collitz, Actes du 5e Congrès des Orientalistes (Berlin 1881), I, 2, p. 287 ff.

[11] Not to be confused with cases of a double vocative etc. (Wackernagel, Grammatik, II, 1, p. 144).

was unnecessarily ascribed to influence of a "Dravidian mentality":[1] this type of compounds as well as the syntactic epanadiplosis from which it has in all probability arisen is also attested in related languages. The curious *divé-dive* "daily" now regarded as a locative,[2] now as a dative[3]— which however is syntactically incomprehensible—seems to have been secondarily created as a locative in -*e* instead of the normal -*i*: the locative is in other Indo-European languages as well as Vedic the most frequent case in these so-called iterative compounds.[4] An instance of an interesting type, which was to become productive in Pāli, was brought to light: *menāmenam*, lit. "exchange for exchange" (for **menă*- "exchange" compare the synonymous Lithuanian *mainas*).[5]

Scholars[6] often forgot to distinguish between nominal compounds and primary nominal derivatives from compound verbs such as e.g. *pratīkṣá*- "expectation" which clearly derives from the compound verb *prati-īkṣ*- "to expect".[7] It is within the range of possibility that what traditionally and according to our dictionaries is a semantically polyvalent compound really represents two homonymous compounds of different origin and formation. It was for instance surmised[8] that *ādeśa*- in the sense of "substitute" owes its origin to a combination of *ā*- and *deśa*-,[9] whereas *ādeśa*- in the sense of "advice" belongs to the verb *ā-diś*- "to point out, teach".

In early texts the order of the members noticed by Pāṇini, 2, 2, 37 and affecting some bahuvrīhis which have a verbal adjective in -*ta*- as their former member is very rare: ṚV. 10,15,9 has *stómataṣṭa*- "fashioned into a hymn" where one might expect **taṣṭa-stoma*-.[10] In view of Gr. βωτι-άνειρα "men-feeding" etc. the order of the members of the type *dắti-vāra*- "giving choice goods"[11] is to be regarded as ancient and regular, although some scholars held different views: bahuvrīhi with inversion[12] (cf. *havyá-dāti*- "presenting oblations") or "he whose *vāra*- is attended with *dāti*-".[13] The explanation of the type *tarád-dveṣas*- "conquering hostility (enemies)"

---

[1] J. Bloch, in B.S.O.S. 5, p. 734 f.
[2] e.g. by Macdonell, Vedic grammar, p. 155.
[3] e.g. by Meillet, in M.S.L. 12, p. 413.
[4] W. Dressler, in Gedenkschrift-W. Brandenstein, Innsbruck 1968, p. 39 ff.
[5] K. Hoffmann, in K.Z. 76, p. 242 ff.
[6] even Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, II, 2, but compare p. 96.
[7] Edgerton, in J.A.O.S. 75, p. 58.
[8] Thieme, in Mélanges-L. Renou, Paris 1968, p. 715 ff.
[9] Wackernagel, Grammatik, II, 1, p. 312.
[10] Cf. Gonda, in Pratidānam, Studies-F. B. J. Kuiper, The Hague 1968, p. 246.
[11] See e.g. Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 215; Schwyzer, Griechische Grammatik, I, München 1939, p. 441.
[12] Geldner, Der Rigveda in Auswahl, I, Stuttgart 1907, p. 81; Renou, E.V.P. X, p. 72.
[13] Oldenberg, Ṛgveda Noten, I, p. 168.

the former member of which was regarded as a participle[1] based on a reinterpretation of *tará-dveṣas-[2] has not found general acceptance, because reliable starting points of this process are few in number. The word for "paternal grandfather" pitā-mahá- was explained as modelled upon mahā-mahá- "very great";[3] thus Kātyāyana's (on Pāṇ. 4,2,36) assumption of a suffix -(ā)-mahá- was preferable to the supposition pitā-mahá- ⟨ *pitā́ maháḥ "great father". It was, further, rightly emphasized that in interpreting compounds the accent is an important clue and that the relevant rules formulated by the ancient grammarians should be given due consideration.[4]

Cases of shortened compounds[5]—i.e. of those compounds one element of which is, or seems to be, omitted—are less rare than many scholars have taken for granted. The simple noun stoma- "praise" may in ritual contexts denote the days and ceremonies called jyotiṣṭoma-, go-ṣṭoma-, āyuṣṭoma-; vrata- "vow, religious practice or observance" occurs instead of mahā-vrata- "name of a definite religious function etc." and of kṣīra-vrata- "fastmilk". It is not surprising that in a technical vocabulary ācamanīya-, lit. "to be sipped (for purification)" should occur for the water used for purification as well as the vessel used for that purpose. The type of telescopy exemplified by svargabrahmaudanau "the svargaudana and the brahmaudana" (two ritually prepared and offered rice-dishes), which is e.g. common in Dutch, is very rare in Old Indian.[6] Precipitation may here also lead to misinterpretations. The word for "rhinoceros" khaḍga-, which is Vedic, was formerly regarded[7] as a shortened form of khaḍga-viṣāṇa- "having a sword(like) horn" (which occurs in Buddhist texts); however, compounds with khaḍga- "sword" make their appearance only at a later time.

The second member of a compound may in favourable circumstances develop into a suffix. The proper meaning of -anta- (jalānte "in the water" ⟨ jala- and -ante "in the midst") was already at an early date not always transparent as appears from the great variety of interpretations proposed for the expression svapnānta- ("condition of sleep, nature of sleep, Ende

---

[1] Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, II, 1, p. 320.
[2] Renou, in B.S.L. 41, p. 218 f.
[3] Wackernagel, in Album-H. Kern, Leiden 1903, p. 150, n. 1 (= Kleine Schriften, p. 402, n. 1); see also the same, Grammatik, II, 1, p. 255; II, 2, p. 281.
[4] S. S. Bhawe, in J.O.I.B. 4 (1955), p. 315 ff.
[5] Some mainly Pāli examples were collected by R. O. Franke, in Z.D.M.G. 44, p. 481 ff. and W.Z.K.M. 8, p. 239 ff. See Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, I, 2, p. 421 and recently Gonda, in Studies-F. B. J. Kuiper, p. 221 ff.
[6] Gonda, o.c., p. 228.
[7] Uhlenbeck, Wörterbuch, s.v.; Lüders, Aufsätze-E. Kuhn, München 1916, p. 314 (= Philologica indica, p. 429).

des Schlafes, la vérité sur le sommeil, the end of a dream"; = *svapnama-dhyaṃ suṣuptam,* Śaṅkara) in the oldest upaniṣads.[1] A diminution of semantic autonomy is to a certain extent also observable in the case of compounds in *-rūpa-* "form".[2] Incidentally a final element turns up which creates the impression of being a reduced form of a noun: thus *-psu-* which after various other interpretations[3] was hazardously connected with **bhas-* "to blow, breath", so that *aruṇá-psu-* might mean "whose breath is ruddy".[4] The existence of anomalies and ambiguous forms should not however induce us to see irregularities where there are none or to reject the generally accepted analysis of a definite compound proposing even a new derivation of one of its members on account of one difficult occurrence.[5]

It is self-evident that compounds lend themselves very well to statistic investigations, e.g. into the number of syllables and the rhythmic distribution of the nominal compounds.[6]

The demonstrative pronoun[7] proved a fascinating field of historico-comparative inquiry, for their heteroclitic paradigms, the incorporation of emphatic or distinctive elements or of other enlargements, the 'original' force of such elements, as well as for the character of their deixis,[8] their etymology and syntactic function[9] etc. The Indian grammarians gave the stems of the generic pronouns *ta-, ya-,* as *tad-* etc., the form in which they appear in the prior member of compounds and in secondary derivatives. The hypothesis[10] that *tad-* etc. in derivation (the younger *tad-īya-* "belonging to him, her, it" etc.) were an extension of *tad-* etc. in composition, which in its turn was supposed to have originated in tatpuruṣa compounds where the sense justified the use of an accusative neuter form in *-d* (e.g. *tad-vaśá-* "longing for that") was refuted[11] on the strength of the consideration that the so-called stems in *-d* of the personal pronouns which are

---

[1] For particulars see Gonda, Altind. *-anta-, -antara-* usw. in Bijdragen Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, 97, p. 453 ff. (esp. 476 ff.); 112, p. 397 ff.

[2] Willman-Grabowska, o.c. I, p. 68 ff.

[3] See Renou, E.V.P. III, p. 29; IV, p. 104.

[4] P. Thieme, in Festschrift-W. Schubring, Hamburg 1951, p. 1 ff.: "démonstration à la fois plausible et fuyante" (Renou).

[5] Thus e.g. H. Frei, in Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure, 20 (1963), p. 55 f.

[6] For the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa see S. M. Katre, in Bulletin Deccan College Research Institute, 3, p. 181 ff., and in New Indian Antiquary 5, p. 83 ff.

[7] K. Brugmann, Die Demonstrativpronomina der indogermanischen Sprachen, in Abh. Sächs. Ges. d. Wiss., ph.-hist. Klasse, 22, 6, Leipzig 1904.

[8] I refer to Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, III, p. 508 ff.

[9] G. Liebert, Zum Gebrauch der *w.*-Demonstrativa im ältesten Indoiranischen, Lund 1954.

[10] Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, III, p. 435 ff.

[11] F. Edgerton, in Studia indo-iranica, Ehrengabe-W. Geiger, Leipzig 1931, p. 156 ff.

used in the same way (*mát-kṛta-* "done by me") and were regarded as created in imitation of *tad-* etc. cannot be an accusative neuter nor another syntactically justifiable case-ending (*mat-* in the above pronoun was incorrectly said to be an ablative) ;[1] that in the Ṛgveda *mad-* etc. in composition are rare, and in derivation absent, stems in *-a-* or *-ā-* (e.g. *tā-dṛś-* "suchlike")—the only ones found in Avestan and Old Persian—being much more frequent. A more satisfactory explanation is as follows: the forms in *-d* originate in morphological analogy from the forms which are used as the stems of substantives[2] and adjectives and which to the exclusion of the forms in *-a-* of the thematic stems[3] coincide in form with the neuter nominative-accusative singular (*mádhu-* "anything sweet": *madhu-vṛ́dh-* "abounding in sweetness", *tad-* : *tad-vaśá-* "longing for that").

After a discussion—which continued for over a century—of the problem whether the relative pronoun had always fulfilled the same function or originally conveyed a demonstrative force,[4] it was argued that the I.E. stem *i̯o-* > O.I. *ya-* has only in the course of time assumed the character of a relative pronoun in the proper sense of the term. Its discernibly oldest function was that of a distinguishing or emphasizing includer which was to a high degree indifferent as to the logical relations between the word (group) introduced and the rest of the sentence: RV. 1,91,9 *yás te ... ūtáyaḥ sánti ... tábhiḥ* ... lit. "the means of helping thou hast ... with these".[5]

The time-honoured practice of teaching that the interrogative pronoun combining with definite particles assumes an indefinite force[6] was criticized by the present author[7] who endeavoured to show that one should not[8] transpose the co-existence of an interrogative τίς and an indefinite τις in Greek etc. into a question of chronological priority—which indeed was never satisfactorily answered—but that at one time the same pronominal forms were, according to their position in the sentence and accent, used to fulfil both functions, and that it was an essentially indefinite pronoun—as such surviving also in the Veda—which could be extended

---

[1] by Grassmann, Wörterbuch, 975 and Thumb, Handbuch, p. 246.

[2] Any Old Indian noun may, at least as final member of a compound, occur as an adjective.

[3] In spite of their frequency the *-a-* stems, being not identical in form with any case-form (except the vocative, which is no proper case and does not occur in pronouns) could not exert this analogical influence.

[4] See e.g. E. Windisch, Untersuchungen über den Ursprung des Relativpronomens in den indogermanischen Sprachen, in G. Curtius, Studien, II, Leipzig 1869, p. 201 ff. For a bibliography: Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, III, p. 557 f. See also ch. V, p. 138 ff.

[5] J. Gonda, in Lingua 4 (1954), p. 1 ff. Syntactic details do not belong here.

[6] e.g. Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 382.

[7] Gonda, in Lingua, 4, p. 241 ff.

[8] with Meillet, in B.S.L. 23, p. 19 f. and others.

by particles. In the idiom *ya- ka- ca* it is not, as was commonly supposed,[1] *ca* that converts an interrogative to an indefinite meaning, but *ca* $<$ I.E. *$k^u e$* was to express complementary connection, *ya-* had its above function and *ka-* really was indefinite: AV. 7,70,11 *yát kím cāsaú ... yác ca ...* "whatsoever (on the one hand: *ca*) he ... and what (on the other hand: *ca*) ...".

The complicated hypotheses in connection with the personal pronouns hardly lend themselves to summarizing.[2] Many of them really are no more than possibilities at best to be accepted with reserve. Thus, according to some scholars the *h* in *mahyam*, the dative singular of *aham* "I", is not original, but replaced (dissimilation) an earlier *bh* which is represented in Iranian forms (cf. also *tubhyam*, dative of *tvam* "you");[3] others however identify this *h* with the χ in Gr. οὐ-χί (an emphatic οὐ "not");[4] a laryngeal hypothesis being *mahyam* $<$ I.E. *$meĝhio$* $<$ *$H_1meĝ-H_2io$* and *tubhyam* $<$ I.E. *$tebhio$* $<$ *$tew-H_2io$*.[5] Some of the main characteristics of this category were however understood at an early date,[6] for instance the partly singular flection (*asmát*, abl. of "we") of the 'plural' pronouns which of course are not comparable to the plural forms of substantives. Nor were scholars long in realizing that the belief that these words hold the key to the origin of all declension was delusive.[7]

The other pronouns may be passed over with the remark that in respect to many details unanimity is far to seek.[8] Thus the loc. sing. of the type *a-smin* has in view of the Avestan forms in *-hmi* ($<$ *$*$-smi*)[9] been supposed to contain either the weak form of the I.E. pre- and postposition *-en*[10] or by way of analogy the final *n* of the endingless locatives of the nasal stems, which then "might have given rise to the illusion that it was an ending".[11]

---

[1] Whitney, Grammar, p. 195; Renou, Grammaire sanscrite, p. 378.

[2] See also W. Petersen, The inflection of Indo-European personal pronouns, in Language, 6, p. 164 ff. who is no doubt right in arguing that only in the course of the prehistoric period these pronouns—which at first seem to have consisted of a conglomerate of stems, used either by themselves or in combination with particles—had developed complete paradigms and G. Liebert, Die indo-europäischen Personalpronomina und die Laryngaltheorie, Lunds Univ. Årsskrift, N.F. 1, 52, 7, Lund 1957 who very properly observed (p. 123) that the part played by analogy in the formation of these pronouns is less important than has often been assumed.

[3] Cf. R. G. Kent, in J.A.O.S. 45, p. 159.

[4] H. Hirt, Indogermanische Grammatik, III, Heidelberg 1927, p. 24.

[5] Liebert, o.c., p. 80.

[6] See e.g. Brugmann, in K.Z. 27, p. 397.

[7] J. Baunack, in M.S.L. 5 (1884), p. 1 ff.

[8] For various possibilities proposed in explanation of the stem *amú-* see C. Hauri, in K.Z. 78 (1963), p. 115 ff.

[9] In a few cases (cf. RV. 1, 174, 4 f.) the metre shows that *-smi* was read rather than *-smin*.

[10] See Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, III, p. 501.

[11] Ghosh, o.c., p. 58.

In the course of the last twenty years there appeared to be room for further discussion of the numerals which led not only to an elaborate re-examination of old questions but also to attempts at solving some basic problems which had never been posed. Attention was invited to the wide-spread tendency, in a variety of archaic and so-called primitive languages, to distinguish dualities—which often are natural couples—and to count pairs. In the Veda *dvaya-* is a frequent term to indicate anything twofold, for instance objects etc. which exist in pairs and these objects are said to constitute a *dvandva-* "pair". The obligate dual number denoted the com-plementary 'two-ness', that is anything double, two-sided etc., which presented itself as a unity, and the numeral for "two" *dvaú* is like *ubhaú*[1] "both" often added to emphasize the completeness of the pair or the unity of two.[2] This being so half of such a duality is not simply "one": *árdha-*, usually translated by "side" or "place, region", refers to part of a spatial whole which often has a complement likewise called *árdha-* (*árdhau* also: "the two parties"); in accordance with a rule of accentuation[3] it is dis-tinct from *ardhá-* which, translated by "half", properly means "constitut-ing one part of a double whole". The word *sāmi-* "half" (in the prior mem-ber of a compound: Lat. *sēmi-* etc.), but also "incomplete", cannot ety-mologically be disconnected from I.E. **sem-* which expressed the idea of "one in relation to a second". The weak form **sm̥-* "forming unity with (a) complementary partner(s)" surviving in O.I. *sa-* helps to form com-pounds for "together with ..., accompanied by" (*sá-gaṇa-* "attended by followers"). The remarkable co-existence of two stems for the numeral "one" becomes intelligible if we realize that O.I. *éka-* belongs to a word family denoting "the one without a second or complement, the unique (one)": *eka-rā́j-* "monarch" (*rā́j-* "king").

Contrary to the opinion upheld by some predecessors[4] there is much to be said for the thesis that as the prior member of compounds *dou-, du-* is the older, *dvi-*, being—like its Latin counterpart *bi- < *dvi-* in *bi-dens* "two-toothed" etc.—productive, is the younger form modelled upon *tri-* which in this position represents the numeral "three": the former often referred to the ancient dualité unité concept,[5] the latter to the 'modern'

---

[1] *ubhayedyuḥ* "on both parts of the day", i.e. "in the daytime and in the nighttime" (P. E. Dumont, in J.A.O.S. 59, p. 425 ff.), not "on two subsequent days" (Monier-Williams).

[2] J. Gonda, Reflections on the numerals "one" and "two" in ancient Indo-European languages, Utrecht 1953.

[3] See chapter III, p. 49 and p. 58.

[4] A. Walde, Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, ²Heidelberg 1910, p. 244; cf. also Bartholomae, in I.F. 23, p. 44 f.

[5] Some interesting observations on the significance of the number two in the Ṛgve-da—"the number that unites while it separates; it is charged with the tension of the op-

idea of "two", e.g. as distinct from "three" or "four". From 102 onwards
dvi- is the only form, in 42-92 *dvā-* and *dvi-* are interchangeable, in 12-32—
no doubt the most used in olden times—*dvā-* is found exclusively.[1] Hence
also the similarity in form of the numerals *ékā-daśan-* "eleven" and *dvá-*
daśan- "twelve", the *ā* in both words originally belonging to the latter:
they once stood for "ten and the (unique) one" and "ten and the pair
(considered as a unity)"; and the remarkable fact that "two", like "one",
is often found as an extra unit above a round number.[2] The tendency to
regard a pair as a unit explains also many particulars in connection with
words which, though often translated by "(an)other", are not equivalent
to "other" in modern languages: O.I. *anya- anya-* (like Lat. *alter … alter*)
means "(the) one … the other"; *anyedyuḥ* "on only one part (of the two
parts) of a day"; AV. 7,35,1 *anyánt sapátnān* does not mean "(our) other
rivals" but "the others, (our) rivals" or simply "(our) rivals"; counter-
parts of the English *murderers and other criminals* are foreign to the Ṛgve-
da, to appear, however, in the brāhmaṇas.[3]

These facts are fairly consistent with the fundamental function of the
adjectives in *-tara-* which, while in a general way emphasizing a difference,
characterize a position as distinct or different from another:[4] an *aśvatará-*
"mule" (*áśva-* "horse") while having qualities in common with a horse is
different from an ass; a *vīrátara-* is a person who distinguishes himself
from others by his heroism; *ítara-* is "this one" as distinct from another
or others, hence translated by "different from" or "the other, another".

There is no point in pursuing the many observations made on each indi-
vidual numeral, for instance on the curious *ṣáṭ* "six", the final *ṭ* of which was
already by Pāṇini (1,1,24) reduced to *ṣ* which, appearing in *ṣaṣṭí-* "sixty",
must represent an I.E. *ḱ* (Av. χšvaš, Lat. *sex* etc.); the initial *ṣ* is expli-
cable as a result of assimilation[5] and the Veda shows no trace of an initial
*ks (Gr. ξέσ-τριξ "six-rowed") which is retained in M.I.A. (Pāli *cha, chal*).[6]

The importance of so-called collective numbers (e.g. *daśát-* "decade")
and numerical substantives was recognized at an early date.[7]

From a study of the nature of the Indo-European decade formations[8]

posites; it is the dialectic number of polarity" etc.—were made by S. Kramrisch, in In-
dological Studies-W. Norman Brown, New Haven 1962, p. 109 ff.
[1] Gonda, o.c., p. 43.
[2] For details: Gonda, o.c., p. 46 f.
[3] For particulars, Gonda, o.c., p. 56 ff.
[4] E. Benveniste, Noms d'agent et noms d'action en indo-européen, Paris 1948, p. 115 ff.
[5] M. Haug, in Z.D.M.G. 7, p. 333.
[6] De Saussure, in M.S.L. 7 (1892), p. 73 ff.
[7] I refer to Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, III, p. 360; 417 ff.
[8] O. Szemerényi, Studies in the Indo-European system of numerals, Heidelberg 1960;
see esp. p. 125 ff.

it emerged that the (feminine) *i*-declension of *viṃśati-* "twenty" (originally "two decades", *śat-* $<$ I.E. **ḱṃt-*)[1] must be considered a purely Indian innovation since even Iranian preserves the old neuter dual form **u̯ī-ḱṃt-ī*. The inflection is however hardly due to *ṣaṣṭí-* "sixty" etc.[2] because no connection can be discovered between "twenty" and "sixty, seventy etc."; the mere fact that all higher decades (from thirty onwards) were inflected must have been decisive. The emergence of numerals for "thirty" etc. in *-śat-* (*triṃśát-* "thirty") can be ascribed to the influence of "a hundred" *śatám* rather than to a supposed origin in an I.E. paradigm nom. sing. **-ḱont-s*, acc. sing. **-ḱont-ṃ* which would have resulted in an acc. **triṃśántam* etc. instead of *triṃśátam*.[3] Meillet,[4] followed by others, was among those[5] who strongly doubted whether the decades for sixty-ninety were fully developed in Original Indo-European, because the correspondence of O.I. *pañcāśát-*, Gr. πεντήκοντα, Lat. *quinquāgintā* is the last member in a series of decades impressive enough to warrant the assumption that they belonged already to the parent language, while the following decades are, because of the considerable variation (O.I. *ṣaṣṭí-* as against Gr. ἑξήκοντα) etc., too dissimilar to be of common origin. However, the fact that the parent language already had the number "hundred", based on the expression for "ten" makes it clear that the numbers sixty-ninety—though not in frequent use—must have existed too,[6] notwithstanding the serious difficulties they present. As to O.I. *ṣaṣṭí-* the in itself improbable suggestion—we have not to do here with a substratum language—to explain this from a sexagesimal system and as a loan-word from Akkadian *(šuššu)*[7] was justly substituted by two attempts at explaining this numeral from etymological processes in Old Indian itself: *ṣaṣ-* + *-śat-* causing phonetic (or euphonic) difficulties was replaced by *śaṣ-* + *-ti-* (cf. *paṅk-tí-*[8] which however means "set or collection of five", not "fifty", whereas *ṣaṣṭí-* never means anything else but "sixty") and I.E. **s(u̯)eḱs-ḱ(o)nt-* $>$ O.I. **ṣac-chat*, which however could have been understood as "six each" *(ṣaṭ-ṣaṭ)* and consequently was transformed into **ṣaś-śati-* $>$ **ṣaś-(śa)ti-* $>$ *ṣaṣ-ṭi-*.[9]

---

[1] For particulars see Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, III, p. 365 ff. For "ten" and "hundred" see E. Risch, in I.F. 67 (1962), p. 129 ff.

[2] as was supposed by Wackernagel-Debrunner, o.c., p. 367.

[3] Szemerényi, o.c., p. 125 ff. contra Wackernagel-Debrunner, o.c., p. 368.

[4] A. Meillet, in Revue des études slaves, 5, p. 177 ff.

[5] See e.g. R. Thurneysen, in K.Z. 26 (1883), p. 311; Schwyzer-Debrunner, Grammatik, III, p. 370.

[6] F. Sommer, Zum Zahlwort, in Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akad. der Wiss., Ph.-h. Kl. 1950, 7, München 1951, p. 81.

[7] Brugmann, Morphologische Untersuchungen, V, Leipzig 1890, p. 34 f.; R. Meringer, in I.F. 16, p. 166 ff.

[8] Sommer, o.c., p. 82.

[9] Szemerényi, o.c., p. 57 f. For the final *-i* see his argument in ch. V of his book.

The numeral "eighty" *aśītí-* is a hard nut to crack. It has long been under-stood[1] as representing an old stem **oḱ-* (different from **oḱto-* in *aṣṭaú* "eight") with, strangely enough, already in the parent language[2] an other-wise unknown formative **-īti-*. The assumption of a development **oḱtə-ti-* > *aśītí-* (with dissimilation of the first *t*, *ə* as the weak grade of *ō*, the dual form for "eight" being however **oḱtōu̯*, and the (doubtful) lengthening of *i* > *ī*)[3] does not lead to a solution. Szemerényi[4] who, unlike his predecessors[5] and in all probability rightly, refuses, in discussing these decades, to operate with abstracts in *-ti-*,[6] again as ingenuously as complicatedly, proposed to assume an I.E. **oḱtō-ḱont-* > Indian **aśtāśant-* which under the influence of **catvārīśant-* (in his view once the form of "forty") be-came **aśtīśant-* and, after "forty" was transformed into *catvāriṃśat*, developed into **aśīśant-*, in the weak stem form **aśīśat-*, and then, by haplology, into **aśīt-* which was stabilized as *aśīti*.

Light was thrown on the term used by Pāṇini (5,2,48) for the ordinals (with the exception of the first),[7] viz. *pūraṇa-* "filling, completing" by the discovery that in addition to the function to which the ordinals[8] owe their name in the West—that is to indicate rank or order—they had another, in olden times essential, task, viz. to characterize a person or an object which by joining a definite group or number completes it.[9] It is this func-tion which explains the identity of the suffix in *aṣṭa-má-* "the eighth", *śata-tamá-* "the hundredth" and in the so-called superlatives: the man who is so to say at the end of those who are active, who completes their group is *apás-tama-* "most active", the *saṃvatsara-tamī́ rā́tri* is "the last day of a year", i.e. "the day that completes *(saṃvatsará-)* the year" (cf. in Lat. *sep-timus* "the seventh": *op-timus* "the best"; *fini-timus* "who is at the limit or border, i.e. bordering upon"). The "first" *prathama-* which cannot fulfil this function is quite intelligibly not derived from a cardinal but from the word for "before, in front" *(pra)*.

A remarkable form for "the fifth" *paṣṭha-* was explained[10] as an ancient ordinal corresponding to Av. *puχδa-*, transformed by *ṣaṣṭha-* "the sixth" and retained in a "rural dialect", or rather, as a technical term indicating five-year-old animals.

---

[1] H. Hübschmann, in I.F. Anz. 11, p. 116.
[2] Wackernagel-Debrunner, o.c., p. 370; cf. Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 261.
[3] Sommer, o.c., p. 83.
[4] Szemerényi, o.c., p. 60 f.
[5] e.g. Wackernagel-Debrunner, o.c., p. 369.
[6] See also Szemerényi, o.c., p. 57.
[7] for which see e.g. Bartholomae, I.F. 22, p. 95 ff.
[8] See also A. Meillet, in B.S.L. 29, p. 29 ff.
[9] Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, III, p. 400 ff.; Gonda, in Bingkisan budi, Opstellen-Ph. S. van Ronkel, Leiden 1950, p. 135 ff.; Benveniste, o.c., p. 145 ff.
[10] Renou, in B.S.L. 43, p. 38 ff.; see also Edgerton, in Language, 29, p. 499.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE VERB

The mutations in the verbal inflection and the transformations of the verbal system were, generally speaking, more radical and interesting than the innovations of the nouns. Although a considerable part of the changes took place in prehistoric times, the high antiquity and the grammatical wealth of the Veda enable us to affirm that these processes were going on in the historical period and to give an exposition of the development of the verbal system which to a considerable extent consists in levelling, simplification, a tendency to obsolescense of some old and incorporation of some new formations and, as a result of these processes, continued re-systematization.

For several decades the study of the Sanskrit verb was greatly stimulated by the ideas expressed in his 'Konjugationssystem' by Franz Bopp[1] (1791-1867). Intending to point out the origin of the inflections of Sanskrit and some related languages he thought these to have constituted parallel developments;[2] in this he was, in principle, wrong, but in recent years the insight has gained ground that not a few at first sight identical forms of Greek and Vedic—which always played a great part in the so-called reconstruction of the parent language—do not necessarily presuppose a common prehistoric unity in some particular point. Bopp was also dominated by the mistaken belief—one of those time-honoured aprioristic mixtures of logic and grammar which have nothing to do with linguistics—that every verb owes its origin to an agglutination of an element containing the concept "to be" (Skt. *as-*, hence the *s* of the *s*-aorist, the future etc.) to a monosyllabic root or to similar processes of 'composition' with some other verbs or pronouns. Following up Bopp's pioneer work there appeared some (mostly comparative and now largely antiquated) studies of the verbal system in general or of particulars such as terminations or the formation of stems.[3] Matters took a turn by the

---

[1] F. Bopp, Über das Conjugationssystem der Sanskritsprache in Vergleichung mit jenem der griechischen, lateinischen, persischen und germanischen Sprache ..., Frankfurt M. 1816; there is an English revision by the author, Analytical comparison of the Sanskrit ... languages, showing the original identity of their grammatical structure, in Annals of Oriental Literature, London 1820, republished in Intern. Zeitschrift für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft 4 (1888), p. 1 ff.

[2] See e.g. B. Delbrück, Einleitung in das Studium der indogermanischen Sprachen, Leipzig 1919, p. 63 ff.

[3] Renou, Bibliographie, 184, 2 ff.; 23; 30; 39; 53; 98.

almost simultaneous endeavour, in the seventies, of Avery[1] and Delbrück,[2] who, while presenting complete and systematic collections of part of the relevant material,[3] based on an analysis of the Ṛgveda and (in Avery's case) the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa, generally refrained from adding historical and comparative explications. Their works and some other publications[4] laid the indispensable foundations of continued research which greatly benefited by the ripened insight into the structure of "original" Indo-European and the relations of Sanskrit to its sister-languages as well as the deepening knowledge of grammatical processes and phenomena in general. In the course of time, grammarians became aware of the importance of the problems relating to the stratification of the forms, to their chronology and to the development of the verbal system as a whole. It was however not before the last decade that it became clear that scholars had too much relied upon Whitney and that many Old Indian verb forms are, morphologically as well as semantically, in urgent need of a new interpretation.

The first scholars to make a systematic study of the extremely numerous verb forms had derived much benefit from indigenous grammatical learning. After two works by Friedrich Rosen[5] Niels L. Westergaard (1815-1878, 1845 professor in Copenhagen) published an inventory of the verbal roots[6] which, preceding an edition of the so-called Pāṇinean Dhātupāṭha —a systematic enumeration of the Sanskrit roots[7]—and a comparison of this list with similar collections, contained material brought together by the author himself. This book became antiquated only after the completion of the Petersburg Dictionary and the publication of the works of Avery etc. and of Whitney's useful and repeatedly re-published Roots (1885) which notwithstanding its mistakes and incompleteness[8] is still much

---

[1] J. Avery, Verb-inflection in Sanskrit, in J.A.O.S. 10 (1880), p. 219 ff. (completed in 1875, first draft in 1872).

[2] Delbrück, Das altindische Verbum (1874).

[3] "General impressions of the changes which time has produced in the word-forms of a language, derived from a cursory perusal of its literature, are apt to be shadowy and misleading" (Avery, o.c., p. 219).

[4] Renou, Bibliographie, 184, 8; 10 ff.

[5] F. Rosen, Corporis radicum sanscritarum prolusio, Berlin 1826; Radices sanscritae, Berlin 1827.

[6] N. L. Westergaard, Radices linguae sanscritae, Bonn 1841.

[7] The knowledge of this collection was required in order to understand the rules given in Pāṇini's grammar which therefore presupposes the existence of works of this description (Liebich, Einführung, II, p. 51 ff.; Renou (-Filliozat), Inde classique, II, p. 88 f.).

[8] which is also due to the publication of many new text editions and indices. The same qualification is applicable to the list of verbs contained in Macdonell's Vedic grammar for students (Appendix I) and to the nearly identical enumerations of verb forms appearing in their appropriate place in his larger Grammar. See also K. Hoffmann, Das Kategoriensystem des idg. Verbums, in M.S.S. 28 (1970), p. 19 ff.

used. As to Whitney's presentation of the relevant material he usually took the indicative 3rd sing. as the representative of the present-system, of which he gave "only so many specimen-forms as suffice to illustrate the mode of formation". However, this procedure, which led him to insert unrecorded forms, was a source of errors and wrong conclusions. Thus the form *māti* "he measures" (p. 119), though given in the Pāṇinean Dhātupāṭha (2, 53), is found nowhere else and was obviously supposed to exist beside the imperatives *māsva* etc., which however are aorists.[1]

After 1870 scholars came to understand that Sanskrit, for all its wealth, age and perspicuity, does not in all respects represent an "original" state of affairs, that its verb system also had suffered alterations. The ancient axiom of the monosyllabic verbal roots—upon which traditional European philologists were agreed with the Indian grammarians—had to be abandoned after De Saussure's Mémoire[2] had demonstrated the "existence" of dissyllabic roots, that is the necessity to assume that in a number of cases the root element was dissyllabic. This theory involved the definitive establishment of the parallelism of the present classes in the traditional Indian arrangement numbered 9, 7 and 5 as being, from the Indo-European point of view formed with an infix *-n-*.[3] The oldest representatives of the 9th and 5th classes should be analysed as *pu-n-ǻ-ti* "he cleanses"[4] and *vr̥-n-ó-ti* "he covers" (middle: *vr̥-n-u-tê*), the second vowels belonging to the root, contrary to the ancient Indian doctrine which, analysing *punǻ-ti*, *vr̥-nó-ti*, holds, however, good for the historical period when analogical forms such as *badh-nǻ-ti* "he binds" deriving from monosyllabic roots had come into existence. Particulars—for instance the mutual relations between the nasalized classes—have remained disputable and since scholars began to realize that the relative chronology not only of the historical but—as far as possible—also of the prehistoric formations should no longer be neglected,[5] the history of these classes in general as well as the mutual relations of particular forms and the explanation of more or less isolated

---

[1] Nevertheless it is regarded as a real present form by Pokorny, Wörterbuch, p. 703 and others. See however G. Cardona, in Language, 41 (1965), p. 16 and Narten, Verb, p. 121 (also Grassmann, Wörterbuch, 1025).

[2] F. de Saussure, Mémoire sur le système primitif des voyelles dans les langues indoeuropéennes, Leipzig 1879, esp. p. 239 ff.

[3] W. Streitberg, in Indogermanisches Jahrbuch, 2, Strassburg 1915, p. 208. A comprehensive study was, in 1906, published by O. Keller, Die Nasalpräsentia der arischen Sprachen, in K.Z. 39, p. 137 ff. in which an attempt was made consistently to distinguish between infixed and suffixed nasals, to describe the different forms of the stems, to distinguish mixed forms and, to a certain extent, to delineate the historical development.

[4] Compare also *pr̥-n-ǻ-ti* "he fills" beside the root aorist *á-prā-t*, traditionally deriving from a secondary root form *prā-* (Dhātupāṭha, 2, 52, distinguished from a synonymous root 9, 19; see e.g. also Whitney, Roots, p. 100; 102).

[5] As was very often the case in Brugmann's times.

cases have given occasion to much discussion. Many questions primarily
concern the comparative linguist, for instance: how far have we, in pre-
historic times, really to do with dissyllabic or with extended monosyllabic
roots,[1] or how are we to solve the riddle of the otherwise uncommon in-
fixation? How far is (Indo-European problems[2] apart) doubt justified
with regard to the solution proposed for the appearance of the unexpect-
ed -*ī*- in *punīmás* (instead of **pu-n-i-más*, *i* being the weak vowel grade
beside *á*), viz. analogy after the type *gṛbh-ṇ-ī-té* (middle: "he seizes")
beside *gṛbhāy-á-ti* "he seizes",[3] and its verbal adjective *gṛbhī-tá-s*, facilitat-
ed by the rhythmical tendency to avoid a succession of short syllables, or
should this tendency—which also accounts for *sunótana* instead of **sunu-
tana: su-* "to press out"[4]—be regarded as the only cause,[5] not, however,
to be named[6] "the appearance of an extra suffix"? Whereas reasons were
advanced for the probability of an originally athematic flection of all
verb forms with the -*n*- infix,[7] the debate on the relation between more or
less sporadic nasalless and nasalized forms—*tu-ñ-j-ánti* "they thrust":
tuj-ánt- "thrusting"[8]—cannot be considered to be closed. In some cases
explanations, though recently proposed or repeated, can be dismissed as
unfounded or superfluous: thus *nind-a-ti* "he blames, reviles", is a themat-
ized nasal verb[9] rather than a reduplicated present[10]; on other points
opinions are with good reason divided.

     Whereas there is much agreement with regard to the 5th class and its
historical -*n*-less verbal and nominal -*u*- formations (*vṛ-ṇ-u-té* "he covers"
middle: *varu-tra-m* "garment"),[11] there remains some uncertainty in ex-
plaining the 8th class, under which the Indians classified a small number
of roots terminating in -*n*- and assuming (according to the Indian theory)

---

[1] F. B. J. Kuiper, Die indogermanischen Nasalpräsentia, Amsterdam 1937, p. 149 f. who
is inclined to be rather positive.

[2] Kuiper, o.c., p. 231 f.; W. P. Schmid, Untersuchungen zur Stellung der Nasalpraesentia
im indo-iranischen Verbalsystem, unpublished thesis Tübingen 1955.

[3] or from the I.E. point of view **gṛbhā-ya-ti*. See J. Schmidt, in Festgruss-R. v. Roth,
Stuttgart 1893, p. 179 ff. The existence of an I.E. formation exhibiting -*n*- + *āi*- (e.g.
Ch. Bartholomae, Studien zur indogerm. Sprachgeschichte, II, Halle 1891, p. 75 ff.; 90)
has rightly been called in question. For the type *gṛbhāyáti* see also J. Kuryłowicz, Étrennes
de linguistique-E. Benveniste, Paris 1928, p. 51 ff.

[4] Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 264.

[5] Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 266.

[6] with Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 326.

[7] Kuiper, o.c., p. 35 f.

[8] Kuiper, o.c., p. 79 ff.

[9] with Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, II, p. 164 and others.

[10] with Debrunner, Nachträge, I, p. 43.

[11] Burrow's formulation (Sanskrit language, p. 323): "The suffix (of this present class),
which is compounded of *n* and *u*, appears also in the formation of nouns ... from the same
roots, e.g. *dhṛṣ-ṇu* "bold" beside *dhṛṣ-ṇo-ti* "is bold" is not exact, because the adjective
which has no counterpart in other languages is clearly secondary (post-verbal).

the suffix *-ó-* : *-u-*. Some scholars are up to the present day inclined to prefer this theory as the simpler one, recalling the Ṛgvedic hapax *tar-u-te* "he passes",[1] but others, considering this form to have been analogically modelled upon the extremely frequent *kar-ó-ti* "he makes" (middle *kur-u-té*)[2]—on the genesis of which opinions are always divided—are not incorrectly inclined to argue that *tanóti* "he stretches" (middle *tanuté*) is formed like *vṛ-ṇ-ó-ti*, *vṛ-ṇ-u-té*, continuing a prehistoric **tṇ-n-eú-ti* (root **ten-*);[3] compare also the verbal adjectives *vṛ-tá-* : *ta-tá-* ⟨ **tṇ-tó-*. As to *kar-ó-ti*, middle *kur-u-té*, beside *kṛ-ṇ-ó-ti*, *kṛ-ṇ-u-té*, is it a genuine and ancient dialect variant with *-ó-* / *-u-?*,[4] then the explanation of the first *u* in the weak forms, *kur-u-té* etc., must be: *kᵘ* ⟩ *ku*, the (I.E.) root being *kᵘer-*; is *karóti* a contamination of the original paradigm *kṛ-ṇ-ó-ti* : *kṛ-ṇ-u-más* and forms beginning with *kar-* : aorist *á-kar-am* etc.[5] and the imperative *kuru* a 'compromise' between *kṛṇu* and **kŭr-dhi*;[6] have the subjunctive and the imperative been the starting-points of the analogical process: *kṛṇávāni* (5th class): *kárā(ṇi)* (root aorist) and hence *karavāṇi*, which led to *karótu*, *karóti* and *kṛṇu(hí)* : *kṛdhí* and hence **kṛʳu(hi)* ⟩ *kuru*, **kṛʳu-ṣva* ⟩ *kuru-ṣva?*[7]

As to the 7th class[8] the main point of controversy is the relative age of the strong forms such as *yunájmi* "I join" which are traditionally analyzed as *yu-ná-j-mi* etc.: some scholars[9] regard them as very ancient, others are inclined to doubt whether this analysis is from the Indo-European point of view tenable[10] (rather: *yu-n-áj-mi*) or whether the type *yunájmi*, complete parallels of which are not with any certainty represented out-

---

[1] Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 324; cf. Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, II, p. 265 f.

[2] Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 266.

[3] K. Brugmann, in K.Z. 24, p. 255 ff.; cf. Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 264; Mayrhofer, Grammatik, p. 81 f.

[4] Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 324.

[5] Cf. Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, II, p. 267 ff., following H. Lommel, in Z.I.I. 8, p. 267 ff. who considers *karóti* as a prakritism, which according to W.P. Schmid, in I.F. 65, p. 235 ff. is very improbable.

[6] Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 266. However, the risk of arguing with forms which are not found in our texts—see also E. Kieckers, in I.F. 43, p. 39: **kuroṣi* ⟩ *karoṣi* under the influence of *karṣi*—should be avoided as long as possible. Moreover, Renou himself had (in B.S.L. 33 (1932), p. 18) observed that an athematic *kar-* *kṛ-* is not likely to form a present stem.

[7] W. P. Schmid, o.c., p. 245 f.

[8] For a comparative survey see J. W. Poultney, The distribution of the nasal-infixing presents, in Language, 13, p. 163 ff.

[9] Keller, o.c., p. 140; Mayrhofer, in Arch. Or. 18, p. 72 ff., and Grammatik, p. 180; cf. also Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 326. K. Strunk, in K.Z. 83 (1969), p. 216, observing that the relation of the middle forms of the 7th class to the middle aorist (*yu-n-k-té* : *á-yuk-ta*) runs parallel with *pṛ-ṇ-á-ti* : *a-prā-t* (p. 86), suggests explaining *yunákti* as a substitute for **yavakti* ⟨ the regular **i̯eu-ṇ-k-ti*.

[10] Streitberg, o.c., p. 208; Kuiper, o.c., p. 43 f.; Benveniste, Origines, p. 159.

side Indo-Iranian, is really old. Indian is alone in having this class also in the case of roots without an *i* vowel—those with this vowel are the most vigorous—, but *anakti* "he anoints", though probably secondarily attracted by the infixing class (one expects *$\acute{o}\dot{n}k^u$-ti*, the I.E. root being *$o\dot{n}g^u$*-) might be explained as I.E. *n-$n\acute{e}$-k^u-ti*.[1] The hypothesis that a reverse development (with its starting-point in roots containing a nasal) can explain the -*n*- infixation in general has rightly been rejected.[2]

Considered as a whole the nasal presents must have been more numerous in the prehistoric period; in the course of time their use becomes less frequent, the 7th class disappearing before the 5th, this before the 9th and the oblique modes falling into disuse before the indicatives.[3] They appear to have been largely replaced by -*aya*- formations. Although an attempt was made to determine their original, essential or common semantic function ("to get or to bring into a definite condition or situation")[4] as well as their functional relation to the other present classes, these difficult and intricate points remain open to further discussion, because hitherto the argumentation was liable to be based on subjective interpretations and misconceptions about the force of antique and prehistoric verb categories.

A passing reference may here be made to the intimate relations between the nasal presents of the 9th and 5th classes on the one hand and the root aorist on the other:[5] *pr̥-n-ā́-ti* "he fills": aor. *á-prā-t*; *str̥-n-ó-ti* "he strews": aor. *á-star*; *śr̥-n-ó-ti* "he hears": aor. *á-śro-t*. This association and the remarkable parallelism shown, also in this respect, by these present classes was no doubt inherited (cf. Gr. πίλναται: ἔπλητο).[6] It is worth mentioning that beside *yu-n̐-k-té* "he joins" we also find an aorist *á-yuj-i*.

The study of the interrelations between the verbal categories naturally led, in the last two decades,[7] scholars to question the correctness of the idea, entertained by leading authorities in the first half of this century,

---

[1] Brugmann, Grundriss², II, 3, p. 278; Strunk, o.c., p. 225.

[2] Keller, o.c., p. 149.

[3] Schmid, Untersuchungen, chapter I.

[4] Schmid, Untersuchungen, chapter III; see also p. 213: "Die -*n*-, -*sk*- und themabetonten Praesentien haben alle einen Terminus (Anfangs-, End- oder Wendepunkt) im Verlaufe ihrer Handlung. Während die 6. und die -*sk̂*- Klasse gerade diesen Punkt erreichen, gerade diesen darstellen, oder von ihm ausgehen, bezeichnen die -*n*- Praesentia den Durchgang durch diesen Punkt und gliedern sich den Folgezustand oder die Wirkung der Handlung ein."

[5] J. Bloch, L'Indo-Aryen, p. 211 f.; Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 282; W. P. Schmid, Untersuchungen, p. 59 ff.; 93 ff.

[6] K. Strunk, Nasalpräsentien und Aoriste, Ein Beitrag zur Morphologie des Verbums im Indo-Iranischen und Griechischen, Heidelberg 1967; S. Andrews, The nasal present and the aorist in the R̥gveda, Thesis Harvard 1961.

[7] But see also A. Meillet, in B.S.L. 23 (1922), p. 65 f.

of an Indo-European verbal system mainly based on Indian and Greek parallels, which implied the assumption of a high antiquity of the Vedic formations. It was, in many respects rightly, argued that the Vedic verbal system is, to a much larger extent than the preceding generations were prepared to believe, a product of a long chain of evolution composed of heterogeneous elements (athematic and thematic formations, special present formantia, a formally distinct perfect etc.). The argumentation was conducted by means of external, i.e. comparative, reasonings which cannot be summarized here,[1] as well as a renewed and refined internal approach to the history of the Vedic verbal system.[2] Special attention is drawn to inconsistencies and seeming redundancies in the synchronous system which may be explained as remains of an older system or as beginnings of a further stage of development and as such are often greatly helpful in elucidating the history of the relevant forms and categories. Thus anomalies may be interpreted as remainders of an earlier system in which, to mention only this, oppositions of tense were more elementary than in the 'normal' Vedic of our texts which exhibit a ramified system, characterized, among other things, by a distribution of personal and impersonal forms in accordance with temporal distinctions; the future makes, in the Ṛgveda, an embryonic appearance; the perfect behaves "unsystematically" inside the tense oppositions and may be supposed to have been a member of an anterior non-temporal system. Study has been made of the close relations between tense on the one hand and aspect and mood on the other: a general characteristic of Vedic is a tendency to create symmetric systems so as to possess tense systems for all moods (there is a present optative, an aorist optative etc., although, it is true, many forms are rare), of those members of the verbal system which may be said to have been "actively operating". Attention is invited to the fact that the difference between the present and the aorist stem is far from being generally carried through: beside stems characterized by one of the comparatively numerous present suffixes (-ya-, -áya-, -cha- etc.) or by the aoristic -s- there are also stems which are devoid of any formal charac-

[1] R. Birwé, Griechisch-Arische Sprachbeziehungen im Verbalsystem, Walldorf-Hessen 1956. For the discussion on the athematic types (2nd class) tā́ṣṭi "he fashions" and staúti "he praises" formerly regarded as ancient, but recently as innovations, see J. Kuryłowicz-C. Watkins, Indogermanische Grammatik, III, 1, Heidelberg 1969, p. 27 ff.; for the 3rd present class ibidem, p. 35 ff.; for the origin of the imperative ending -sva (pronomen reflexivum?), ibidem, p. 52 f.

[2] T. Ja. Elizarenkova, Aorist v Ṛgvede, Moscow 1960; the same, On the problem of the development of tenses in Old Indo-Aryan (The Rigveda), Proceedings 25th Int. Congress of Orientalists, Papers presented by the USSR delegation, Moscow 1960 (this article constitutes an English extract of the author's above book without the ample analysis of the Ṛgvedic aorist-system). See also E. A. Makajev, in Studies-F. B. J. Kuiper, p. 32.

teristic: *á-tir-a-t* functions as an imperfect because of the existence of a present indicative *tir-á-ti*, but *á-ruh-a-t* is an aorist, because there is no corresponding form with primary endings *(*ruh-á-ti)*. These and other unsystematic features may induce us to assume the existence, in a previous period, of a single present-aorist formation, which in the course of time must have differentiated.

Whereas the study of the conjugations was long mainly comparative in character, more recent publications tend therefore, in keeping with this general trend in investigating the Sanskrit verbal system, to emphasize the necessity for complementing and at the same time refounding comparative research by a thorough examination of all internal evidence accessible. The method applied primarily is as far as possible historical; but, chronological priority and posteriority being not always self-evident, authors cannot on all occasions escape the necessity to marshal part of their material so as to fit in better with the lines on which the phenomena have, or are assumed to have, developed. Analogy is here also a very important factor in the history of the formations: a grammatical pattern, especially if represented by much used forms, permits the speakers to produce new speech-forms, which under favourable circumstances (similarity in sound or meaning, etc.) may oust existing synonyms.[1]

The speculations concerning the prehistoric connections between the thematic and athematic presents should not detain us here,[2] but the intriguing co-existence of the two thematic classes, the 1st, e.g. *bhár-a-ti* "he bears", and the 6th, e.g. *tud-á-ti* "he thrusts", concerns Sanskrit scholars and comparatists alike. Already for many years sound grounds have been brought to light for rejecting the hypothesis that both types originated in the same paradigm which then must have admitted a shift of accent[3] and for doubting the original[4] character of the latter type in contradistinction to the greater antiquity of the morphologically identical aorist (*á-rud-a-t* "he wept"),[5] from which it might have developed[6] when "in the Ṛgvedic period" a thematic present of the type *juṣ-á-te* "he enjoys" came into existence beside the thematic aorist so as to form a new present system. It has in this connection been observed that the forms of the 6th

---

[1] Cf. also M. Leumann, in I.F. 57, p. 205 ff.

[2] See e.g. Kuiper, o.c., p. 73 ff. For a succinct bibliography: Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, I, 2, p. 226. For a résumé of the discussions of the pertinent problem from the I.E. point of view: Meillet, in B.S.L. 32 (1931), p. 194 ff.; Kuryłowicz-Watkins, o.c., ch. IV.

[3] K. F. Johansson, De derivatis verbis contractis, Uppsala Univ. 1886, p. 114 ff.

[4] By this term I never mean anything else than: belonging to the earliest stage of development into which we can penetrate by means of our hypotheses.

[5] De Saussure, o.c., p. 9.

[6] E. Leumann, in Actes du Xe congres intern. orient. I, p. 41 ff.; K.Z. 34 (1897), p. 587 f.

class with primary endings are comparatively few in number.[1] Arguments in favour of this hypothesis are the sometimes—but by no means always—unmistakable momentary or terminative force of presents of the 6th class: *(vi, pra) tir-á-ti* "he reaches the opposite side" beside *tár-a-ti* "he passes over"[2] and their preference for combination with preverbs.[3] It is a fact that in the Veda—and no doubt also earlier—the number of *tud-á-ti* presents developing from athematic forms[4]—and tending to replace them in the course of time—increases: *yuv-á-ti* "he unites" beside *yaú-ti* etc.[5] Forms of the type *śram-a-t* (*śram-* "be weary") and others which, deriving for the greater part from stems which are not formally characterized and may therefore be interpreted as aorists or as presents, may on the other hand be adduced in substantiation of the hypothesis that once there was no thorough and systematic distinction between a present and an aorist stem.[6] It does not seem unreasonable to suppose that the ancient and very common indicatives of the 1st class which had or acquired not only an aspectual but also a temporal function—the latter came, gradually, more to the fore—, contributed, especially after the significance of the augmented forms began to increase, considerably to regulating and fixating the Vedic present-aorist system and to setting a model for the analogic spread of the thematic *tud-á-ti* formation.

Among the forms of not rarely indubitably athematic descent[7] which, adding to the richness of the Vedic verbal system, joined the 6th class special mention may be made of those characterized by an -*n*- infix (*á-pi-ṃ-s-a-t* "he crushed" beside *pi-ná-ṣ-ṭi*)—cases such as *śubh-ā-ná-* (athematic participle), *śu-m-bh-á-ti* "he is beautiful; beautifies", *śú-m-bh-a-ti*, *śóbh-a-te*, are not wanting—and a group of stems containing the I.E. suffix -*ske/sko*- (> -*cha*-), part of which was likewise analogically transferred to the 1st class: *u-chá-ti : vas-* "to dawn"; *gá-cha-ti : gam-* "to go". The latter group, which in Indo-Iranian is rather limited and unproductive, supplies the place of thematic presents[8] and may be said to denote, in the

---

[1] 91 against 670 non-indicative forms: Renou, Mélanges-Vendryes, p. 313; see also Elizarenkova, Aorist, p. 44 ff. From this it does not necessarily follow that the 6th present class originated in an old non-indicative system as is assumed by Renou, o.c.

[2] Delbrück, Vergleichende Syntax, II, p. 90; Meillet, Introduction, p. 203; Renou, in Mélanges linguistiques-Vendryes, Paris 1925, p. 309 f. and Grammaire védique, p. 270; justified doubt: Brugmann, Grundriss², II, 3, p. 114 f.

[3] This point must be discussed in a chapter on syntax. See p. 132; 141 f.

[4] Notice *kṣé-ti* "he resides, dwells", plural *kṣ-iy-ánti* which admitting of thematic reinterpretation gave rise to *kṣiy-á-ti*.

[5] Kuiper, o.c., p. 74 ff.

[6] For a modification of Burrow's opinion on this point (Sanskrit language, p. 296) see Gonda, Aspectual function, p. 266 f.; 270 f.

[7] Kuiper, o.c., p. 83.

[8] J. Vendryes, in Mélanges d'Indianisme-S. Lévi, Paris 1911, p. 173 ff. (who, p. 180 f.

Veda, as probably also in prehistoric times, processes occurring repeatedly, frequently, usually, continually, gradually or consisting of a complex or series of (partial) processes[1]—*r̥-chá-ti* "to move towards"; *gá-cha-ti* "to go"; cf. also *i-chá-ti : iṣ-* "to seek, desire"; hence also its occasionally slightly perceptible iterative or intensive character[2]—rather than inchoative modifications.[3]

There are more extensions or formative elements of this type,[4] the force of which has been a matter for much, and in most cases undecided, disputation.[5] However, one of these elements, viz. *-ya-* (I.E. *-i̯e/i̯o-*), deserves closer attention. This suffix serves to form the 4th present class (e.g. *gr̥dh-ya-ti* "he is greedy") as well as the so-called passive (*dr̥ś-yá-te* "he is seen"), the only difference lying in the place of the accent.[6] After Whitney[7] who thought that the latter type is used "only in a passive sense" scholars became gradually aware of the fact that it often denotes processes which are usually called "intransitive".[8] It has even been shown[9] that it is especially in the Veda in most cases an 'eventive'; that is to say that the process which it denotes bears upon movements, experiences, transformations with regard to a state or condition experienced by the subject, to his reactions etc.: *muc-yá-te* "he (it) gets loose"; *śiṣ-yá-te* "he remains, is left". In other cases the *-yá-* form denotes a process which is more or less involuntarily supposed to be brought about by an agens, e.g. *han-yá-te* "he meets his death, is killed". If, in a small number of cases, the agens is ad-

---

wrongly includes *mlecchati* "to speak indistinctly": *mleccha-* "stammerer, barbarian" which no doubt is a non-I.E. stem). For the origin of *-(c)cha-* now see Kuryłowicz-Watkins, o.c., p. 56 ff.

[1] Latin and Greek incohatives such as *inveterasco* "to grow old", *ardesco* "to take flame, to increase in violence" beside *ardeo* "to be on fire"; Ved. etc. *mūr-cha-ti* "to become solid, stiff, senseless" essentially express the same modification of the verbal idea. See also W. Dressler, Studien zur verbalen Pluralität, Vienna Acad. 1968.

[2] Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 271.

[3] Thus e.g. Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 328; see also Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, II, p. 232.

[4] A. Meillet, Sur les suffixes verbaux secondaires en indo-européen, M.S.L. 11, p. 297 ff.

[5] M. Bloomfield, On differences of use in present-systems from the same root in the Veda, in P.A.O.S. 1882, p. CXXVI, did not succeed in discovering clear and consistent "functional or dialectic" distinctions. See also Kuiper, o.c., p. 63 ff. The *-i-* in *án-i-ti* "he breathes" etc. is an instance of an element which in Old Indian makes the impression of a suffix in spite of its original character as the second part of the complex called root (unclear: Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 320).

[6] See already Delbrück, Verbum (1874), p. 166 f.

[7] Whitney, Sanskrit Grammar, p. 275 (§ 768).

[8] Delbrück, Altindische Syntax (1888), p. 268: "überwiegend passivisch"; J. S. Speyer, Sanskrit Syntax, Leiden 1886, p. 239 f. (§ 319): "often intransitive passive"; E. Leumann, Zur Geschichte der vierten Praesensklasse des Sanskrit, Lecture Strassburg 1901: denominative-intransitive.

[9] J. Gonda, Remarks on the Sanskrit passive, Leiden 1951, passim, and especially p. 73 ff.

ded we may speak of a passive construction.[1] The relation of this category and the 4th present class was explained as an "Anlehnung" of the former to the latter which is preponderatingly 'intransitive'; *kṛś-ya-ti* "he is lean",[2] as a specialization of the middle voice of the 4th class,[3] or as a development from that class.[4]

There is however no occasion for resignation[5] or preposterous theories,[6] because[7] both *-ya-* groups can be shown to have sprung from one and the same *-i̯e-/-i̯o-* formation. From the fact that the root syllable, though accented, very often appears in its weak form (*śúṣ-ya-ti* "he (it) becomes dry or withered") and other details concerning the accentuation it may be inferred that that formation—which already at an early period was often found beside other present-stems deriving from the same root—was characterized by an accented suffix. A number of *-i̯e-/-i̯o-* eventive presents in other languages moreover corresponds to Indian *-yá-* forms, e.g. Greek σχίζεται "(e.g. a river) branches": *chid-yá-te* "its gets torn, gets split", the corresponding active verbs of transitive function being athematic (*chinátti* "he cuts off, splits"). Similarly, Greek θείνεται: *han-yá-te* "he meets his death (by someone's hand)", but *hán-ti* "he kills". Joining active (and middle) presents of the same root these *-yá-* forms succeeded in developing by way of analogy, into a regular so-called passive formation. Those presents of the 4th class which have an eventive force (e.g. *kṣúdh-ya-te* "he is hungry"), part of which must be old (*mán-ya-te* "he sets his mind or heart on etc.": Greek μαίνεται "he rages"), may be supposed to have shifted their accent under the influence of those presents with the same suffix, but a strong root syllable (*páś-ya-ti* "he sees" etc.), many of which were also eventives (*śrā́m-ya-ti* "he is weary") and of co-existent presents of the 1st class,[8] which were always tending to be models of analogical innovations.

In connection with the development of the verb system and the relative antiquity of definite formations mention must also be made of the interesting and no doubt old group of denominatives[9] in *-aryati, -anyati* in the

---

[1] For further particulars see p. 133 f.
[2] Delbrück, Verbum, p. 168.
[3] Renou, Grammaire sanscrite, p. 463.
[4] M. Leumann, in I. F. 57, p. 229.
[5] Brugmann, K.V.G., p. 528.
[6] P. Diels, Über das indogermanische Passivum, in Jahresbericht 91 (1913) der schlesischen Gesellschaft für vaterländische Kultur, IV b, p. 1 ff. denies the historical identity of both groups and considers the Indo-Iranian 'passive' an ancient formation, lost in the European. For a refutation see Gonda, o.c., p. 83 f.
[7] Gonda, o.c., p. 83 f.
[8] For further information: Gonda, o.c., p. 84 ff.
[9] For the denominatives in general see L. Sütterlin, in I.F. 19, p. 480 ff.; Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, II, p. 353 ff.

Ṛgveda which may be regarded as "survivals" of—or rather as being based on—the prehistoric system of the nominal suffixes *-r- (-l-)/-n-* :[1] the participle *udan-yán* "giving water, irrigating" cannot be disconnected from the *-r-/-n-* stem *udan-* "water"; beside *rathar-yá-ti* "to go by chariot" we find a nominal *rathar-vĭ-* "name of a species of snake"[2] which likewise presupposes a stem **rathar-* "chariot".

Another old formative element is the widespread *-s-*. Though in some cases recognized very early[3]—beside *bhī-* "to fear" there are e.g. also forms deriving from the homonymous *bhyas-*, e.g. *bhyas-e-tām—*, its significance was not fully evidenced before serious attempts were made to bring it into connection with other sigmatic categories.[4] One of the difficulties besetting those who attempt to unravel the intricate problem of the interrelation of *-s-* aorists, *-s-* futures, and *-s-* presents (and of the 'original' functions of these categories)[5] resides in the fact that it is often hardly possible to decide whether a root ending in *-s-* contains this determinative, that is, constitutes an extension of a shorter root. Although, for instance, a causative force of this *-s-* seems in a number of cases beyond doubt,[6] the etymological relation of *iṣ-ya-ti* "he causes to move quickly, casts, sends out, throws" and *i-* "to go"[7] is questionable. Anyhow, even if *bhakṣ-* "to partake of, eat" really be only an extension of *bhaj-* "to divide, share", in the Veda they are two independent verbs, and the *s* is in cases like this no (or no longer a) formative element. There does not however seem to be reasonable ground for eliminating the admissibility of the hypothesis[8] that a *-s-* 'originally' was one of the distinctive features of the aorist-present system which, while having a great future in the aorist, had, because of the differentiation into two systems, no further development in the present, to survive in an anomalous form such as *stu-ṣ-é* "I praise".

There is now even much to be said for the hypothesis that the often more or less voluntative future of the type *dā-syá-ti* "he will give", which

---

[1] L. Renou, in B.S.L. 37, p. 17 ff.
[2] This word is, it is true, in itself not clear ("ring-snake"?); compare also *rathirá-* "possessing a chariot".
[3] A. F. Pott, Etymologische Forschungen, I, Lemgo 1833, p. 167 ff.; 278 ff.; II², 1, (1861), p. 566 ff.
[4] H. Pedersen, Les formes sigmatiques du verbe latin et le problème du futur indo-européen, Kopenhagen Acad. 1921.
[5] which will be discussed elsewhere.
[6] F. B. J. Kuiper, Zur Geschichte der indogermanischen s- Präsentia, in A.O. 12 (Leiden 1934), p. 243 etc.; J. Gonda, Four studies, p. 90.
[7] assumed by Kuiper o.c., p. 252, but by way of precaution left unnoticed by Pokorny, Wörterbuch, I, p. 299 and Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, I, p. 94.
[8] Cf. Elizarenkova, Problem, p. 14.

in the early period was, especially in its middle forms, comparatively rare, as it is in the Avesta, is, not, as was assumed in the beginning of this century,[1] a continuation of desideratives with *-iṣy-a-* (I.E. *-əs-i̯e-*), but a specialized type of present stem which is genetically related to the productive type *pí-pā-s-a-ti* "he wishes to drink, thirsts", that is the reduplicated thematic *-s-* presents: compare the functional similarity of a regular desiderative such as *mú-muk-ṣ-a-te* "he wishes to free himself" and *mokṣ-ate* "idem, he seeks freedom, deliverance":[2] *muc-* "to loose". These facts are in harmony with recent views of the Indo-European future[3] which unlike older opinions[4] tend towards serious doubts about the existence of a full-fledged temporal category of this character in original Indo-European or even in an early prehistoric period. The so-called prospective subjunctive prevailed instead.[5] The controversial discussion upon the 'original' character of the future *-s-* forms in Sanskrit—voluntative-desiderative,[6] purely 'modal' (i.e. subjunctive)[7]— cannot however be said to have reached finality, but the comparatively 'decided' and 'emphatic' character of the *-syá-* future[8] is no longer open to question. Its spread was no doubt largely due to an increasing need of a decidedly temporal form to denote processes which will take place later than the moment of speaking.

As is well known the Indo-European athematic verb forms were in the course of time becoming obsolete and largely replaced by thematic forms, part of which must have arisen already in prehistoric times. Even the athematic root aorist, which in the Ṛgveda is more common (over 100 roots) than the other types, is not very productive; of 65 roots there exists, moreover, also another aorist, in most cases one formed with *-s-*,[9] but if the ending begins with a consonant and there exist other thematic forms, also a thematic aorist (*á-r-a-t* beside *ā-r-ta : r̥-* "to go, move").[10] This

---

[1] Cf. W. Schulze, Sitzungsberichte Berlin 1904, p. 1434 ff.; Brugmann, Grundriss, II², 3, p. 387; refuted by Kuiper, o.c., p. 296 ff.

[2] Cf. Pāṇini, 7, 4, 57.

[3] Gonda, Moods, passim; Elizarenkova, Problem, p. 19.

[4] See e.g. Hirt, Indogermanische Grammatik, IV, p. 177.

[5] Whitney, Grammar, p. 333 (§ 937). That is not to say, with E. W. Hopkins, in A.J.P. 13, p. 34, Miss E. A. Hahn, Subjunctive and optative. Their origin as futures, New York 1953, and others, that the subjunctive originally expressed time and was a future.

[6] Hopkins, o.c., p. 1 ff.; p. 48 "From prehistoric times a desiderative *s*, when united with the present stem, the function of which had been to express time, imparted to that stem as it did to simple roots the force of volition". The desideratives were studied by J. Charpentier, Die Desiderativbildungen der indoiranischen Sprachen, Archives d'études Orientales, 6, Uppsala 1912.

[7] Kuiper, o.c., p. 288; gainsaid by Renou, in B.S.L. 56, p. 13 f.

[8] Gonda, Moods, p. 76; 177 f.

[9] Elizarenkova, Aorist, p. 69 ff.

[10] Elizarenkova, Aorist, p. 88 ff.

development tended to establish a certain correlation between the thematic aorist which often replaced the active forms of the root aorist and the -s- aorist which superseded its middle forms. Yet the occurrence, in the Veda, of athematic innovations is undeniable, but, though recognized by several authors, the extent of this phenomenon did not always attract much attention. Incidentally the factors which may have determined this inverted development can be traced with a fair change of correctness: thus *trāti* "he rescues" may in GB. 1, 1, 2 be regarded as being given access to a religious text instead of *trāyate*, which corresponds to the Avestan present θrāya-, because of its greater appropriateness[1] as an element in an etymological argument ("the son, *putra-*, rescues, *trāti*, from the hell called *put*"), and in the late passage VāsDhŚ. 30, 6 it is no doubt preferred because it rhymes with its semantic relative *pāti* "he protects".[2]

The tendency towards thematized forms made some scholars fail to raise the question as to whether a definite ambiguous form is correctly considered thematic. The 3rd person plural *a-dṛś-an* (TS., JB.) can for instance be explained as a regular root aorist so that the usual equation *a-dṛś-am* (which should be starred) = Gr. ἔδρακον and the assumption of an I.E. thematic aorist *(e)-dṛk̑-et[3] is inadmissible.[4] It goes, however, too far to contend that a thematic aorist *adṛśam* never existed at all;[5] we should rather say that it does not occur in our texts.

Another source of error is the misinterpretation of forms which when viewed outside their context are ambiguous. Thus *nāśati* "to attain", regarded as a present indicative by Whitney and many others,[6] is rather to be regarded as an aorist subjunctive.[7] Especially clear is the character as a subjunctive of those forms which occur beside root aorists and unambiguous present indicatives and subjunctives, e.g. *kárati* beside *ákar*, *kṛṇóti* "he makes", *kṛṇávat*.[8] The recognition of these forms as aorist subjunctives

---

[1] Narten, Verb, p. 122 speaks of an 'etymologisierende Kunstbildung'.

[2] Cf. Wackernagel, in Festgabe-H. Jacobi, Bonn 1926, p. 7, n. 1 (= Kleine Schriften, p. 423, n. 1).

[3] Brugmann, Grundriss, II², 3, p. 126; Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, II, p. 300; Frisk, Wörterbuch I, p. 368.

[4] Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. 344; the same, Festgabe-H. Jacobi, p. 16 f. (= Kleine Schriften, I, p. 432); Kuiper, in I.I.J. 3 (1959), p. 205 f.; Hoffmann, in I.I.J. 4 (1960), p. 119 f.

[5] Narten, Verb, p. 117.

[6] Whitney, Roots, p. 89; Pokorny, Wörterbuch, p. 316; Frisk, Wörterbuch, I, p. 513 etc.

[7] K. Hoffmann, M.S.S. 2, p. 122 ff. Cf. e.g. ṚV. 1, 165, 9; 4, 23, 4. On these forms see also Renou, in B.S.L. 33, p. 5 ff.; 61, p. 3; Hoffmann, in M.S.S. 7, p. 89 ff.; Kuryłowicz, L'apophonie en indo-européen, Wrocław 1956, p. 28; Kuryłowicz-Watkins, o.c., p. 64 f.

[8] According to Whitney, Roots, p. 21 a present indicative, but correctly interpreted e.g. by Macdonell, Vedic grammar, p. 368 f. and translated (e.g. ṚV. 1, 43, 6; 4, 22, 1) by Geldner.

proves the supposition that in the cases under consideration the synchronous verbal system lacks this form—which however is characteristic of the
mantra idiom—to be erroneous. However, a study of these forms of *kr-*
and similar forms of some other verbs led Renou to assume "l'existence
ancienne d'un éventuel thématique, indépendant de toute catégorie verbale: de cet éventuel dériveraient d'une part le subjonctif en -*a-* ..., d'autre
part, au moins en partie, les présents du type *bhavati*". The limited number
of pertinent forms and the functional (semantic) side of the problem
permit some doubt.

A comparison between the mere enumerations of forms in Whitney's
roots and the older handbooks on one hand and some recent discussions of
verb forms on the other show us that scholars now begin to ask themselves
if, and how far, paradigms may be established which have a chance of
being really synchronous. It would indeed be a naive and foregone conclusion to believe that all forms of the regular paradigms of our grammars always did exist together in the same milieu or that the occurrences
of one form proves the simultaneous existence of all other forms of the
same paradigm.[1] The middle -*s-* aorist of *yuj-* "to join" does not for instance prove by itself the existence of a parallel active notwithstanding
ayaukṣīt given by a grammarian. Especially when conclusions with regard
to a synchronous state of affairs are corroborated by historical evidence
it is nowadays becoming the generally received opinion that in this point
also matters were more intricate than our predecessors were disposed to
think. Thus the normal aorist of *dṛś-* "to see" seem to have been, in the
brāhmaṇas, *a-darś-am, a-drāk (a-drāk-ṣī-s, a-drāk-ṣī-t), a-dṛś-ma, a-drāṣ-ṭa,
a-dṛś-an,* which is reflected by Pāli forms such as 1 sing. *adassam ⟨ adarśam,
addā ⟨ adrāk, addakkhi ⟨ adrākṣīt.*[2]

A peculiar group of singular second persons in -*si*, hardly found outside
of the Ṛgveda, was long taken to be "probably indicative persons of the
root-class, used imperatively".[3] Most of them indeed have an imperative
sense making an urgent request to a god, e.g. *prá...dhakṣi* "burn!"; a
minority however occur in subordinate clauses and are therefore explicable
as subjunctives. Grassmann (in his lexicon) explained some, modern
scholars[4] all, other occurrences as such, or at least as especially associated
with the subjunctive of the -*s-* aorist, a hypothesis which is in harmony

---

[1] See also L. Renou, in I.F. 70 (1965), p. 218.
[2] Hoffmann, in I.I.J. 4 (1960), p. 120.
[3] Whitney, Grammar, p. 237 (§ 624); Macdonell, Vedic grammar, p. 336; Renou,
Grammaire védique, p. 261; 368. Cf. e.g. ṚV. 1, 42, 9; 1, 76, 3; 1, 92, 7; 1, 132, 4; in a
subordinate clause e.g. 1, 63, 8.
[4] Narten, Sigmatische Aoriste, p. 39; 45 f. etc.; G. Cardona, in Language, 41 (1965), p.
1 ff.

with the fact that the majority of these forms belong to roots which do not exhibit a present of the root-class. Basing himself on the results reached by his predecessors Szemerényi[1] ventured to consider the subjunctive use as the more original and to explain the curious ending as a result of haplology: *-s-a-si* 〉 *-si*. This solution, which is supported by the occurrence of *darṣasi : dṛ-* "to split", is indeed more attractive than the "possibility" that they represent a nominal form in the *-s-* aorist system:[2] there are other cases of presumable haplology outside the compounds.[3] It is not however wholly satisfactory because only a few Ṛgvedic *-si* forms function as subjunctives and the assumption that the ending *-si* was used to the almost complete exclusion of *-s* is not in harmony with the fact that in the corresponding 3rd sing. *-t*, not *-ti*, is most common. It might perhaps be suggested that in the sigmatic aorist, which originally had no imperative, *-si* 〈 *-sasi* acquired imperative value as a result of the alternation between 2nd sing. imperatives and 3rd sing. subjunctives.

That the reduplicated aorist—e.g. *a-ci-krad-a-t* "he cried out" *(krand-)* —which is substantially a (prehistoric) development of Indo-Aryan, was not essentially different from a reduplicated present was already recognized by Delbrück[4] and Macdonell,[5] but its main peculiarities—the prevalence of the typical reduplicating vowel *ī* (*ū* if the root vowel is *u*) and its usual attachment to causative presents—were not elucidated before the last decades.[6] Originating in a non-causative reduplicated present-stem—one of the starting-points being an imperfect *á-jī-jan-a-t* corresponding to the Avestan present *zī-zan-ə-nti* "they bring forth" (compare Latin *gi-gn-i-t* "brings forth")—it is supposed to have developed its 'causative'—but initially transitive-factitive—function in contradistinction to the middle forms (compare Gr. γίγνεται "comes into being"), and, for rhythmical reasons, a decided preference for a long reduplicative syllable—the *i*, normal in the present reduplication, is an indicium of its origin—because[7] for instance in cases such as *di-dī-* "to shine" the characteristic *-ī-* in the root syllable was to disappear before a vowel. It carried

---

[1] O. Szemerényi, in Language, 42 (1966), p. 1 ff.

[2] Cardona, o.c., p. 18.

[3] Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 66 f.; 219. Schmid's attempt to explain these forms as old (Untersuchungen, p. 213) is untenable. Szemerényi's hypothesis was criticized by Cardona, Haplology in Indo-European, Philadelphia 1968, p. 55 ff.

[4] Delbrück, Das altindische Verb, p. 111.

[5] Macdonell, Vedic grammar, p. 373 (§ 513).

[6] Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 335 f.; M. Leumann, in Indological Studies-W. Norman Brown, New Haven 1962, p. 152 f., who does not mention Burrow.

[7] According to Leumann's subtle but perhaps partly superfluous explanation (o.c., p. 156): some of the corresponding Avestan reduplicative presents apparently exhibit the same feature; a succession of several short syllables is widely avoided.

through thematization so as to adopt its characteristic quadrisyllabic form, and assumed as normal the aorist function[1] in opposition to imperfects such as *á-jan-aya-t* "she brought forth, gave birth to" beside the indicative *jan-áya-ti*, so as to constitute by way of suppletion a regular aorist to the causatives—also *á-ti-ṣṭhi-p-a-t* beside *sthā-p-aya-ti : sthā-* "to stand"—of which it originally was independent.[2] Accordingly, the large majority is active. There are some roots which have, in some respect or other, remained unaffected by this process. Thus *a-du-druv-a-t* is, for instance, not causative (*dru-* "to run"); *(á-)dī-dhar* is athematic (*dhṛ-* "to hold"); in *ápupot* (*pū-* "to cleanse") the reduplicating vowel is moreover short.

The relations between the reduplicating presents (3rd class) and the in the Veda rather frequent intensives of the type *né-nek-ti* (*nij-* "to wash") continued to engage the attention, for instance of those scholars who, on the strength of not unimpressive general considerations (the function of this device in other languages) but scanty philological arguments, attempted to show that at one time all reduplicatives were iterative or intensive in function.[3]

How much our understanding of a verbal category may gain by a methodical investigation based upon a complete collection of material appears from Miss Narten's conscientious disquisition on the comparatively well-defined category of the -*s*-aorists.[4] In view of the abundance of the relevant material the results of her study may on the whole be regarded as final. The vowel gradation—lengthened grade in the active indicative, elsewhere full grade—is as far as the roots in *ā*, *ĭ*, *ŭ*, consonant, nasal are concerned still productive in the -*s*- aorists, in the -*iṣ*- aorist it is petrified in survivals. Those roots which end in a consonant after *i u ṛ* (e.g. *yuj-* "join, yoke") do not appear to have had inherited -*s*- aorists, their middle forms being—like the complete active -*iṣ*- aorist—innovations based on ancient root aorists. Roots ending in *r l* exhibit only active forms. In contradistinction to the -*s*- aorist the -*iṣ*- aorist proved—already in the ṚV.—productive so as to spread over any type of root: *a-mand-iṣ-ur* (*mand-* "be exhilarated"); *a-yodh-ī-t* (*yudh-* "fight"). The author does not enter into a discussion of the prehistory of this category and only occasionally touches on the difficult problem of identifying definite forms

---

[1] Vendryes, in M.S.L. 20, p. 122.

[2] See e.g. Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 286; Grammaire sanscrite, p. 443.

[3] Delbrück, Grundriss[1], IV, 2, p. 16 ff.; Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, II, p. 227; cf. also Vendryes, in M.S.L. 20, p. 117.

[4] Narten, Sigmatische Aoriste. For participial forms in -*asāna*-: S. Insler, in K.Z. 82, p. 1 ff.

as aorists, but her very argument reveals that this category is in the Veda constituting a new system rather than continuing a previous state of affairs. It has indeed been shown long ago[1] that the -s- aorists are, from the I.E. point of view, largely innovations, preferred to root aorists and a-aorists for reasons of rhythm (avoidance of successions of short syllables[2]) and clearness (the -s- prevents vowel contraction).[3] As to the -iṣ- aorist we now know that it initially was in special evidence before endings beginning with a dental and in the subjunctive and optative:[4] forms such as (ṚV) 1st sing. vádh-ī-m "I have slain"—which our predecessors[5] liked to "explain away" as analogous innovations based on the 2nd sing. vádh-ī-s and the 3rd vádh-ī-t—are in the Atharvaveda replaced by a-vadh-iṣ-am which was modelled upon the presumably older 2nd dual vadh-iṣ-ṭam, 2nd plural vadh-iṣ-ṭa etc. With regard to the prehistory of this element the last word has not yet been spoken.

The infrequent -sa- aorist[6] may arrest our attention somewhat longer because the history of its elucidation can in a small space give a good idea of the continual progress of grammatical research. The older grammars limited themselves to the statement of some characteristic facts: it is inflected like an imperfect of the -á- (6th) class and is taken by a restricted number of roots having i u or r as radical vowel and ending in consonants which become k before -sa-; middle forms are rare, optatives and participles are waning. Whitney's[7] explicative remarks did not carry his readers much further: "So far as the middle forms are concerned, this aorist would be fully explained as a transfer of certain -s- aorists to an a-inflection. The marked difference in strength of the radical vowel in the active, however, stands in the way of the successful application of such an explanation to the active forms". Brugmann,[8] without observing the rareness, in the earlier language, of this type—which he at first identified, afterwards connected, with present forms containing -kṣ- such as ukṣáti "he sprinkles" collected more or less striking parallels from the other I.E. tongues but, disagreeing with Meillet[9] who on the strength of numerous

[1] A. Meillet, in Mélanges de linguistique-F. de Saussure, Paris 1908, p. 81 ff.
[2] Middle forms of the type á-sic-a-ta : sic- "to pour" are rare: Whitney, Grammar, p. 305.
[3] Cf. also Narten, o.c., p. 27 who omitted quoting Meillet, o.c., p. 89 f.
[4] A. Meillet, in B.S.L. 34, p. 127 ff.; L. Renou, in B.S.L. 35, p. 1ff.
[5] Delbrück, Verbum, p. 188; Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. 305 f., etc.
[6] For the forms see Whitney, in A.J.P. 6, p. 275 ff.; cf. also G. Cardona, The Indo-European thematic aorists, (unpublished) thesis Yale 1960; an alternative explanation was proposed by Insler, in M.S.S. 26, p. 43.
[7] Whitney, Grammar, p. 326, § 919a.
[8] Brugmann, Grundriss¹, II, p. 1190; Grundriss², III, p. 420 ff. Compare also Thumb, Handbuch, I, p. 385.
[9] A. Meillet, in Mélanges-F. de Saussure, Paris 1908, p. 99; cf. also Hirt, Indog. Grammatik, IV, p. 250.

Latin perfects on -*xit* was inclined to regard the internal -*kṣ*- as inherited, did not commit himself to an explicit opinion of its existence in original Indo-European. Bechtel's[1] attempt to identify this category genetically with the Greek aoristus mixtus—we nowadays realize that the very absence of completely identical forms and the intimate relation of the Greek category to the future should prevent us from following him—was rejected by Wackernagel,[2] to whom the idea suggested itself that this type of Indian aorists originated in the verb *duh*- "to milk". Macdonell[3] saw that the thematic *a* "came to be employed to avoid a difficult agglomeration of consonants" before many endings. Later on the Swiss savant,[4] pointing out that the middle forms described as -*sa*- aorists are of three sorts— part of the persons are athematic -*s*- aorists, others genuine -*sa*- aorists, others again may belong to both paradigms—arrived at the conclusion that the verbs under discussion originally had -*s*- aorists, but introduced -*sa*- because before dentals the *s* was suppressed (e.g. *á-dug-dha* instead of **á-duh-s-ta*, i.e. historically **á-dhugh-s-ta*). Following up this classification of facts Leumann[5] argued that the -*sa*- class must have split off from the middle forms of the athematic -*s*- aorist because this has the weak grade of its vowel in common with the -*sa*- class. The middle 3rd plural,[6] especially of *duh*-, which is exceptionally frequent in this diathesis, originally *a-dhuk-ṣ-ata*, was replaced by *a-dhuk-ṣ-anta*, because the former form was reinterpreted as a 3rd sing.—it indeed occurs as such—the regular singular *adugdha*[7] being homonymous with the root imperfect. Summarizing and continuing these investigations Miss Narten[8] lastly drew attention to a possibility of analogic spread: beside *a-duh-ata* (imperfect, 3rd plur.) there was an aorist *a-dhuk-ṣ-ata*, and so the corresponding active aorist *a-dhuk-ṣ-an* was apt to arise beside the imperfect *a-duh-an*. She also pointed out that the -*sa*- paradigm, morphologically being an s-extension of a thematic weak-vowelled formation, could spread over a number of roots with the weak grade of their vowels so as to constitute a type of aorist which was distinct from the imperfect: hence, e.g., post-Vedic *a-dik-ṣ-at* beside the imperfect *a-diś-a-t* "he pointed".

---

[1] F. Bechtel, in G.G.A. 1888, p. 406.

[2] Wackernagel, in Programm Univ. Basel 1897, p. 46 (= Kleine Schriften, p. 807), adding "Wie sie (= diese Bildung) bei diesem (Verb) erwuchs, entzieht sich bis jetzt unserer Kenntniss".

[3] Macdonell, Vedic grammar, p. 385.

[4] Wackernagel, in K.Z. 46 (1914), p. 273 ff. (= Kleine Schriften, p. 291 ff.).

[5] M. Leumann, Neuerungen, p. 48 f.

[6] Not the active 1st person singular as supposed by Renou, Grammaire sanscrite, p. 448 f.

[7] Cf. Pāṇini, 7, 3, 73.

[8] Narten, Sigmatische Aoriste, p. 75 ff.

The precative, confined to expressions of wish, which in its earliest form is, in the active, not to be distinguished from the optative of the root aorist (*bhū-yā-s : bhū-* "to become") and, in the middle, from that of the sigmatic aorist, has long been considered a purely Indian innovation, unconvincing suppositions being based on the influence of parallel imperfect and -*s*- aorist forms of roots in -*ā* (*a-yā-m, a-yā-s-am : yā-* "to go", hence *bhūyāsam* beside *bhūyām*)[1] or on other possibilities of analogy.[2] The curious 3rd sing. *bhū-yā-s* was moreover regarded as a substitute for an older (pre-Vedic) **bhū-yā-t*,[3] of which there is no evidence. However, this -*s* endings has now been shown to be inherited from Indo-Iranian[4] and the precative as a category to be an interesting archaism. On the basis of the Vedic forms—there are a small number of precatives made from other aorist stems than those mentioned above—the characteristic -*ās* of the 2nd and 3rd persons was, in the active, extended to other persons: 1st sing. *bhūyā́sam*, 1st plur. *kriyā́sma : kr̥-* "to make". The appearance of this internal -*s*- is an innovation still unknown to the older parts of the R̥gveda. The 3rd sing. in -*yā-t* which as the result of a normalizing tendency was to become the regular form in classical Sanskrit, does not appear until the AV. The typically precative paradigm, which was to survive after the Vedic period, was rapidly constituted in the later saṃhitās. In the middle there are no Vedic extensions of forms with the internal -*s*- (Vedic 2nd dual *bhavi-ṣ-īy-ā́thām*, but class. *bhavi-ṣ-īy-ā-s--thām*, the -*s*- being inserted in the termination!).

Reserving a more detailed discussion of the use of the perfect for further consideration in the chapter on syntax it is convenient here to recall the observation made by Whitney:[5] while consisting in classical Sanskrit only of an indicative, mainly of the 3rd persons, and a participle—both of them in the active and middle voice—, the perfect system provides us with a much more complete picture in the oldest language. The comparative frequency of this category (2406 indicatives, 1563 of which are active, as against 1986 imperfects and 989 aorists)[6] in the R̥gveda—where it occurs in 240 verbs, i.e. in about 2/3 of all roots—was never to be surpassed in later texts. In the Atharvaveda the number of perfects, especially of the middle forms

[1] K. Brugmann, in I.F. 34, p. 392 ff.

[2] J. Bloch, in M.S.L. 23, p. 120 ff.

[3] Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 291.

[4] T. Burrow, in Asiatica, Festschrift-F. Weller, Leipzig 1954, p. 35 ff.; on the ending, the same, in I.I.J. 1, p. 61 ff., attempting to show the high antiquity of other 3rd persons singular without -*t* (e.g. *śáye* "he lies": *śí-*); in particular cases difficulties remain unsolved. See also K. Hoffmann, in M.S.S. 20, p. 25 ff.; W. Cowgill, in M.S.S. 25, p. 27 ff.

[5] Whitney, Grammar, p. 279 (§ 780).

[6] J. Avery, in J.A.O.S. 10, p. 219 ff.

and the participle, is perceptibly smaller, the vast majority of them being also Ṛgvedic;[1] its function is less variable. While, remarkably enough, it is scarce in the oldest brāhmaṇa texts,[2] the younger brāhmaṇa and the ensuing narrative texts make much more frequent use of this category. These facts cannot be disconnected from the history of the spoken language. From the smaller number of occurrences in the 'popular' hymns, dialogues and incantations, from Middle Indo-Aryan in which only a few traces are left[3] and from a piece of information furnished by the grammarian Patañjali ($\pm$ 100 B.C.)[4] it appears that there it has largely fallen into disuse at a comparatively early date. Disagreeing with Oldenberg,[5] who supposed the oldest brāhmaṇas to represent the inherited state of affairs, which in the Ṛgveda was drastically modified due to the flight of the poetical imagination and the exigencies of versification, Renou[6] remained convinced that the Ṛgveda, in which the original 'stative' and 'resultative' force of the perfect is very well retained, is the sole basis and 'origin' of the evolution of this category in India. This opinion however takes no account of its comparative infrequency in Old Iranian. So there is some probability that the oldest prose not only represented a more advanced stage of development of the function of the perfect, but also was, with regard to the number of its occurrences, more in keeping with the trend of the spoken language. The poets of the Ṛgveda on the other hand seem to have taken full advantage of all possibilities, whether traditional or of a more recent character, afforded by this category while making an uncommonly profuse use of it. The nature of its subjects and the points of view from which these are conceived and dealt with were certainly not foreign to this particular development. In the younger brāhmaṇas this deviation from the spoken language was apparently re-introduced in a modified form.

As I cannot here go into those morphological details which are closely linked up with comparative Indo-European problems, I must omit inter alia summarizing the discussion of the undecided question presented by the few unreduplicated perfects (e.g. *veda* "he knows") in their relation to the large majority of reduplicated forms.[7] The curious forms of the type

---

[1] L. Renou, La valeur du parfait dans les hymnes védiques, Paris 1925, p. 3.
[2] W. D. Whitney, in T.A.P.A. 23, p. 5 ff.
[3] Bloch, L'Indo-aryen, p. 231.
[4] J. Bloch, in M.S.L. 14, p. 97. According to Pāṇini 3, 2, 115 the perfect is used to indicate events at which one has not been present, which in many cases excludes its use in the 1st person (see above).
[5] Oldenberg, Altindische Prosa, p. 25.
[6] Renou, La valeur du parfait, p. 188 ff.
[7] Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, II, p. 276 f. Compare also R. Birwé, Griechisch-arische Sprachbeziehungen im Verbalsystem, p. 33 ff.

u-vāc-a "he spoke"—which was to survive—beside the regular and in any case Indo-Iranian *va-vāc-a* (ṚV.) was either strangely enough taken to be inherited,[1] although it occurs in no other I.E. language, or explained from an unknown **vu-vāc-a* (dissimilation) replacing *va-vāc-a* (assimilation). One might rather consider contamination with the type *u-v-oc-a* (*uc-* "be pleased"), the weak stems *(ūc-e : uc- ; ūc-ur : vac-)* being regularly identical. The long vowel in *ta-tāp-a : tap-* "go give out heat" (but Gr. γέ-γον-ε), explained by Brugmann[2] by a long disputed and now refuted theory that I.E. *o* in open syllables became, in Old Indian, *ā*, is nowadays with a certain probability regarded as due to the influence of I.E. perfects with the lengthened grade of the vowel (type *scābī* in Latin, ἄρ-ᾱρ-α in Greek)[3] supported by a well-known rhythmical tendency;[4] in the Veda this form served to distinguish the singular 3rd person from the first *(ta-tap-a)*.[5] The neutralization of this distinction in later texts may—under the influence of the forms with a closed medial syllable—have been facilitated by the increasing rareness of the 1st person.

The reduplicated injunctives and augmented reduplicated preterits present an intricate problem to the elucidation of which many scholars have contributed their mite, although finality has not yet been reached. After Benfey[6] had supposed part of these forms to belong to the perfect system and to indicate the priority of a past event over another past event, Delbrück[7] following him on the first point, spoke, it is true, of a pluperfect, a category which, being non-existent in the later language, was not recognized by the Indian grammarians. He however disagreed with his predecessor in respect of the function of this category, which is unlike that of the Latin pluperfect; he saw that this preterit could belong, as an ordinary past time, to the presentic perfect just as the imperfect belongs to the present indicative. Comparative linguistics are of no avail because the Greek formation is an innovation and the difficulties reside in the occasional thematic vowel and the vowel of the reduplication. The perfect is athematic, can therefore a form such as *á-sa-svaj-a-t* "he embraced" be a pluperfect?; are forms such as *a-du-druv-at* (*dru-* "to run"), if not expressing a "decidedly aoristic value",[8] not rather to be assigned to the

---

[1] Meillet, Introduction, p. 181; Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, I, 2, p. 286. For the other explanation see B. Ghosh, Linguistic introduction to Sanskrit, Calcutta 1937, p. 36.
[2] K. Brugmann, in K.Z. 24, 1 ff. and elsewhere. See above, p. 25 f.
[3] Thus F. Bechtel, Hauptprobleme der indogermanischen Lautlehre, Göttingen 1892, p. 165; Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, II, p. 278.
[4] Thus Renou, Grammaire sanscrite, p. 454.
[5] See also A. Debrunner, in Kratylos, I, p. 44.
[6] Benfey, Grammatik, p. 383, n. 2.
[7] Delbrück, Verbum, p. 121 ff.
[8] Whitney, Grammar, p. 312 (§ 868 a).

perfect-system? Thus after prolonged differences of opinion[1] with regard to the delimitation between these forms and the reduplicated aorist[2] the insight gained ground that an important criterion by which to distinguish between the oldest reduplicated aorist and the oldest perfect preterits is their function or syntactic use.[3] According to Thieme[4] this is the only criterion enabling us also to infer that the Veda had retained a number of aorists with *a* as the reduplicative vowel and that only part of the reduplicated aorists have the causative force which is normal in the classical language, and which has apparently developed in those aorist stems which were clearly opposed to intransitively used middle or active forms (e.g. *róc-a-te* "he is bright": *á-rū-ruc-a-t* "he made bright"). One should however beware of a dogmatic application of this criterion, because in a considerable number of cases the Vedic aorist does not refer to the immediate past as was taken for granted by Thieme.[5] Especially in the case of an incomplete paradigm we must content ourselves with a non liquet.

The injunctive is one of the most remarkable phenomena of Vedic morphology. Correctly defined by distinctive morphological criteria[6] it is an unaugmented verbal form with secondary endings (*bhar-a-t* beside *a-bhar-a-t* imperfect and *bhar-a-ti* "he bears" present indicative). The ancient Indian grammarians did not recognize it as a separate category. In Pāṇini's times it was a living form only in connection with the so-called vetative particle *mā*[7] (*mā sṛj-as* "do not send") and this fact is taught in his grammar together with the statement that the Veda has many unaugmented forms without *mā*.[8] This is true. It is indeed in non-prohibitive

---

[1] See e.g. Joh. Schmidt, in K.Z. 25, p. 61; Whitney, Grammar, p. 295 (§ 817 ff.); Avery, in J.A.O.S. 10, p. 253; Delbrück, Vergleichende Syntax, II, p. 228 f.; Macdonell, Vedic Grammar, p. 364 (§ 494 f.).

[2] See also Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 280 f.; Elizarenkova, Aorist, p. 40 f.

[3] Cf. e.g. Whitney, Grammar, p. 295 (§ 817 a).

[4] P. Thieme, Das Plusquamperfectum im Veda, Göttingen 1929 (cf. p. 4).

[5] Gonda, Aspectual function, esp. p. 80 ff. See also Leumann, o.c., p. 21 ff. who in particulars disagrees with Thieme.

[6] The use of the term in a twofold sense, viz. non-genuine subjunctive and "unaugmented counterpart of augmented forms" (cf. e.g. K. Brugmann, Kurze vergleichende Grammatik, Strassburg 1902-04, p. 551) is decidedly to be rejected. Nor should we describe it as an indicative deprived of its endings or as a morphologically ill equipped category (Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 248; 368). Contrary to a general unanimity in opinion (Kuryłowicz-Watkins, o.c., p. 45 f.) J. C. Wright ("The so-called injunctive": B.S.O.A.S. 33 (1970), p. 184) unconvincingly denies the existence of the injunctive, arguing away the unity of its paradigm and relying upon improbable suppositions about the structure of the verb in general.

[7] Some forms were moreover included in the classical Sanskrit so-called imperative. The fact that they could—beside other functions!—be adhortative from the oldest texts does not however prove the correctness of Macdonell's (Vedic grammar, p. 316) view that this formation originally expressed an injunction.

[8] Pāṇini 3, 3, 175 f.; 6, 4, 74 f.

use (i.e. without *mā*) very frequent in the oldest corpus, much less usual in the Atharvaveda and as good as wanting in Vedic prose and later literature. The injunctive, formed on the basis of present, aorist and perfect stems has long been a crux adding to the difficulty of many Ṛgvedic passages. After having gradually been distinguished from other forms it was claimed for Original Indo-European by Delbrück[1] and disconnected from the imperfect by Brugmann[2] who was rightly followed by most scholars in regarding it as a separate mood but was justly attacked by the former for his thesis that **bher-e-t* "he bore" and **bher-e-t* "in a subjunctive sense"—a distinction which Delbrück made just as well—were not identical, a serious disadvantage of this view being the implication that **e-bher-e-t* was more original than **bher-e-t*: it is on the contrary an established fact that the augment became obligatory only in the course of time. Delbrück[3] however erred in supposing the injunctive to have been an offshoot of the indicative and to have originated in the aorist, because in his opinion[4] the aorist injunctives constituted the oldest mass of this category and I.E. **mē dhē-t* (inj. aor. of *dhē-* "to put") could have arisen in order to express the idea "he must not put, let him not put" beside **ne e-dhē-t* "he did not put" and—if I understand him correctly—have spread without *mā* on the basis of the simultaneous existence of both constructions. The fact that in the Ṛgveda and in the Avestan Gāthās[5] *mā* only occurs in connection with the injunctive does not indeed mean that this formation originally did not occur unless it was accompanied by this particle. Dismissing Delbrück's suggestion Streitberg[6] argued that the 'modal'—an oft used but incorrect term for 'non-indicative'—function was secondary and had developed in sentences expressing an expectation etc. on the side of the speakers. Concurring in this opinion Hirt[7] went even further and maintained that the use of this category as a subjunctive and imperative derived from its character as a future, because in the Ṛgveda most injunctives are aorists and an aorist representing momentary action must refer either to the past (which is not the case here) or to the future. This explication, which considers only the chronological sequence of moments in which the present is an infinitesimal point, is erroneous, also

---

[1] B. Delbrück, Syntaktische Forschungen, IV, Halle S. 1879, p. 68.

[2] Brugmann, Morphologische Untersuchungen, III, p. 1 ff.

[3] Delbrück, Vergleichende Syntax, II, p. 355 f.

[4] In this he concurred with C. W. E. Miller, in A.J.P. 13 (1892), p. 420.

[5] See Reichelt, Elementarbuch, p. 317; 320; 322 f.

[6] W. Streitberg, in I.F. 9, Anz., p. 170; his opinions were unfortunately never published in full.

[7] H. Hirt, in I.F. 12, p. 212 ff. and Indogermanische Grammatik, IV, p. 291 ff.; VI, p. 266 ff.

because futures as distinct categories are generally speaking a comparatively late development in the I.E. languages.

In contradistinction to the above authors and to Whitney,[1] Miss Hahn,[2] Renou[3] and others who were reluctant to give up the idea that the injunctive is, on the strength of an actual or assumed parallelism with other formations, to be regarded as more or less identical in function with other moods including the imperfect and the aorist indicative, the present author[4] made an attempt to show that the injunctive is an old and inherited formation; that it originally was not an augmentless past indicative but a mood sui generis which, lacking the modal and temporal characterization of the other forms—it does without modal or temporal formative elements —, recalls by its very functional vagueness, which contrasts so strikingly with the temporally and modally well-defined greater part of the ancient Indian verb forms, similar categories in different families of languages.[5] The very possibility of an occasional "complex"[6] value and its chameleon-like nature is to be considered an original characteristic of this formation which was largely retained in the language of the mantras which had preserved more of the "old world", of the "primitive" mental structure, than texts composed in a later period in which this form had as a result of a socio-linguistic process rapidly declined. Hence the impossibility of rendering the injunctive into a modern Western idiom, as may also appear from the widely different translations of the same text-place. In many passages any translation is indeed apt to add to the original, to modify it in some way or other, because the so-called syntactic instability of this formation results from its being fundamentally different from the modal and temporal forms to which we are accustomed. There are even grounds for arguing that the injunctive was primitive in another sense of this term, viz. in that it was the root of a double development, viz. into the present indicative which differentiated itself by its typical so-called primary, but then historically younger terminations, and the historical tenses which came to be characterized by the augment.[7] However, the

[1] Whitney, Grammar, p. 221 (§ 587 a): "The tense value of the non-modally used forms is more often past than present. Of the modally used forms, nearly a third are construed with *mā* prohibitive; the rest have twice as often an optative as a proper-subjunctive value".

[2] E. A. Hahn, Subjunctive and optative, New York 1953, p. 38 ff.; 142.

[3] Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 368: "now equivalent to a present, now a semi-modal form 'exprimant l'éventuel'; as an unaugmented imperfect or aorist it is equivalent to 'un prétérit faible'".

[4] Gonda, Moods, esp. p. 36 ff.; cf. p. 31 f. See also Elizarenkova, o.c. (p. 87, n. 2), who independently arrived at similar conclusions.

[5] Cf. also L. Renou, in Étrennes de linguistique offertes à E. Benveniste, Paris 1928, p. 63 ff.

[6] Renou, ibidem.

[7] Now also K. Hoffmann, Der Injunktiv im Veda, Heidelberg 1967, p. 35.

injunctives on the one hand and the modally and temporally characterized forms on the other co-exist in the language of the mantras. An investigation into the synchronous relations between these two groups based on a minute philological examination of the texts was recently instituted by Hoffmann,[1] who succeeded in delimiting the function of this category more exactly.[2]

The probably insoluble question of the origin of the personal endings, which roused the special interest of the first generation of Indo-Europeanists, did not cease to fascinate scholars like Hirt[3] and Burrow[4] who on the strength of the—in any case frequent—correspondence between these verbal elements and nominal suffixes are convinced that by some process of adaptation certain nominal functions became associated with particular persons and numbers so that at least a fair proportion of the terminations came into being in this way. However, the impossibility of showing any functional relation between for instance the ending of the 2nd plural -ta (bhár-a-ta "you bear") and the homonymous nominal suffix -ta- (bhar-a-tá- "to be borne, to be maintained") presents unsurmountable difficulties,[5] notwithstanding the curious similarity between the plural 3rd persons -anti (dviṣ-ánti "they hate") and -an ⟨ *-ant on the one hand and the participle stems (dviṣ-ánt- "hating") on the other which in itself might point to a nominal origin of the former category. It is moreover clear that this problem is indissolubly connected with the vexed question as to the existence, in prehistoric times, of endingless forms. Lying beyond the scope of this book this problem must be left out of consideration. The primary endings characterized by i and the imperative u (bhar-a-tu "he must bear")[6]—which historically may be identical with the slightly adhortative particle u which often accompanies an imperative—have on the other hand been explained as enlargements of the secondary terminations (bhar-a-ti : a-bhar-a-t) ;[7] if the injunctives (bhar-a-t) are the oldest category,[8] to all appearance rightly.[9]

---

[1] K. Hoffmann, o.c.

[2] We shall have to revert to it. See p. 124 ff.

[3] Hirt, Indogermanische Grammatik, IV, p. 105 ff.; the same in H. Hirt-H. Arntz, Die Hauptprobleme der indogermanischen Sprachwissenschaft, Halle S. 1939, p. 81 ff.

[4] Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 316 ff.

[5] The explication of somaṃ sunuta "press out the soma" (imp. 2nd pl.) as "the soma pressed" (verbal adjective: Hirt, Indog. Grammatik, IV, p. 119) is sheer fantasy.

[6] Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, II, p. 199.

[7] Thurneysen, in K.Z. 27, p. 172 ff.; Gonda, Moods, p. 47 f.; Elizarenkova, Problem, p. 17. For an abortive counter-argumentation: W. Mańczak, in Studi linguistici—V. Pisani, Brescia 1969, p. 653 ff.

[8] See p. 107.

[9] For other questions pertaining to the endings see for the time being Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, II, p. 193 ff.

The history[1] of the curious -*r* endings has now been largely elucidated.[2] At first belonging, in all probability, to the 3rd plural of the perfect—which in older times, though often associating itself with the middle voice of other tenses,[3] was as to its forms almost exclusively an active category—(*vid-úr* "they know"; *ca-kr-úr* "they have made"), and not being characterized as a primary ending, it was introduced into the augmented forms of the (reduplicated) perfect-stem, the so-called pluperfect *(a-vi-vyac-ur* "they encompassed" beside the perfect *vi-vyác-a)* and penetrated other augmented categories, viz. the reduplicated aorist, the athematic secondary flection of the present—especially that of the reduplicating class *(a-bi-bhar-ur* "they bore" beside *a-bi-bhr-an)*—, where it apparently replaced old forms in the ambiguous termination *-at* (Av. *da-d-aṭ*: Ved. *á-da-dh-ur* "they put, set"), and, successfully, also the optative (Av. *bar-ay-ən*: Skt. *bhar-ey-ur* "they might bear"). The intricate middle forms exhibiting a variant type of endings existing beside the regular ones do not lend themselves well to summarizing. It may suffice to say that instead of the Indo-Iranian *-rai* (Av. *sōi-re*: Ved. *śe-re* "they lie", present; *duh-ré* "they give milk")[4] the middle perfect has, in the Veda after a long syllable *-i-re* (*ja-gm-i-re* "they have come" as against *yu-yuj-re* "they have yoked") which came to affect, first, stems with a long vowel (*ūc-i-re* "they have spoke") and then, often in avoidance of a cluster of consonants, dissyllabic stems (*ta-takṣ-i-re* "they have fashioned"), so as to appear, in classical Sanskrit, in all forms (*ca-kr-i-re* "they have made"). As an apparently simultaneous process the -*i*-, which had originated in forms such as *da-di-ré* ($<$ *de-də-rai*) which beside the active *da-d-úr* was re-interpreted as *da-d-iré*, forced its way into other finite forms (Ved. *ca-kṛ-má*: Cl. Skt. *ca-kr-i-ma* "we have made") and the participle. Interestingly enough the *i* is not accented in contradistinction to the first syllables of two-syllabled endings.[5]

---

[1] For the history of the relevant research see also Wüst, Indisch, p. 104 and Hirt, Indog. Grammatik, IV, p. 123—whose own view (originally nominal, the -*r* being identical with that of the heteroclitic nominal stems *ahar/ahnaḥ*) is untenable; the juxtaposition of forms such as Skt. *á-dur* "they give" (read: "they have given"): Gr. δῶρ-ον (read: δῶ-ρο-ν) "gift" cannot have demonstrative force—and F. Bader, in B.S.L. 62 (1967), p. 102 ff.

[2] Leumann, Morphologische Neuerungen. Cf. also Kuryłowicz-Watkins, o.c., ch. XIII.

[3] Compare also the alternation *vāvṛdhé* (middle sing.): *vavṛdhúḥ* (active plur.): *vṛdh-* "to grow" (Renou, in B.S.L. 24, p. 3; 185). Several scholars argued in favour of the originally middle force of the element -*r*- or -*r̥*. It is probably preferable to say that it may have been neutral as to voice, expressing the idea of the general person ("they", german "man"). The structure of the Indo-European medio-passive endings became much clearer with the discovery of Hittite and Tocharian.

[4] For a bibliography see Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, II, p. 211 f.

[5] Recently a speculative attempt was made to shed light on the first singular medio-passive endings of Indo-Iranian, the characteristic *i* contained in these forms (cf. e.g. the

The puzzling 3rd pers. sing. of the so-called passive aorist in -*i* which is characterized by three extraordinary features (the isolated ending -*i*, non-zero grade of the root and root accentuation: *pā́di*) has elicited many more or less ingenious or complicated hypotheses.[1]

athem. *nám̐-s-i, yu-ñ-j-e, -e < ai*) being considered a primary tense marker (W. Cowgill, in Studies-F. B. J. Kuiper, p. 24 ff.).

[1] See Thumb-Hauschild, I, 2, p. 298 f.; recently, S. Insler, in I.F. 73, p. 312 ff.; "if in the pres. pass. Indo-Iranian used only the 3rd sing. ending *-ai (bruve)*, a form coinciding with the 1st sing. *-ai*, then in the aorist pass. one analogically replaced the 3rd sing. *-a* by -*i* in order to utilize a desinence that equally coincided with the (newer) *i of the 1st sing."; for a less complicated hypothesis see Kuryłowicz-Watkins, o.c., III, 1, p. 52: on the strength of Hettite and Celtic this formation is "in origin simply the bare root, the neutral verbal notion alone, in the 3 sg., the non-personal form with zero-ending", the -*i* being identical with the -*i* in the endings -*mi, -si*, which however are characteristic of the present system. —For the ending -*e* of the 3rd pers. etc. see ibidem, p. 88 ff.

CHAPTER FIVE

SYNTAX AND STYLE

The Father of Indo-European comparative syntax,[1] Berthold Delbrück (1842—1922),[2] laid also the foundations of the study of Indian syntax as a separate division of Sanskrit grammar. Basing himself, as directly, thoroughly and independently as in those days was possible, on the Vedic texts themselves, and especially on well-established facts,[3] he did not neglect any aids to deepening his insight into the syntactic phenomena. His endeavour to describe these comprehensively was a great improvement upon the inadequate and haphazard treatment of syntactic problems in the works of his predecessors; his desire to detect regularity counterbalanced the traditional belief, propagated by the great Indian grammarians (Pāṇini) and commentators (Sāyaṇa!), in the possibility, in the Veda, of all sorts of grammatical licence and irregularities in sentence structure or in the use of nominal and verbal forms. Banishing from his linguistic work any influence from philosophical or psychological principles he was the first to treat problems of Sanskrit and comparative syntax in a thoroughly methodical and (comparatively) complete way. Yet, although his method of collecting and classifying, comparing and contrasting large numbers of similar utterances was never fundamentally superseded, his carefulness and sound scholarship hardly surpassed, it proved open to refinement and amplification. The material used in his clear and well-balanced Altindische Syntax (1888)[4]—mainly extracted from three saṃhitās and two brāhmaṇas—was, in fact, far from complete; many details were—quite intelligibly in a pioneering work—overlooked; too much emphasis was laid on prose texts as 'normal' forms of speech; for various syntactic subtleties he could not, in his days, have an eye. From the study of post-Vedic syntax his successors could see things more in historical perspective, than he, the comparatist, was inclined to do. The evolution of syntactic science in general, and the application of its methods to living languages in particular, opened up opportunities to detect new

---

[1] For some of his predecessors who cannot be considered here, see Wüst, Indisch, p. 108 f.
[2] Delbrück, Grundriss. See E. Hermann, Berthold Delbrück, in Indogerm. Jahrbuch, 8, p. 259 ff.
[3] Delbrück, Altind. Syntax, p. VI.
[4] Whitney's long review in A.J.P. 13, p. 271 ff. is still worth reading.

interpretations of established facts and to comprehend the raison d'être of 'rules' and 'exceptions'.

It is interesting briefly to compare the structure of Delbrück's Vedische Syntax with Speyer's Sanskrit Syntax,[1] which had appeared two years earlier. In view of the deficiency in the treatment of syntactic problems of the Indian grammatical works Speyer—who could, it is true, utilize many pertinent notes in Whitney's grammar—broke, too, new ground, but could not avoid following, in the main, the structure and schemata of the traditional descriptions of Latin syntax: section I General remarks; II Syntaxis convenientiae and syntaxis rectionis (concord etc.); III The classes of nouns and pronouns; IV The verbs; V The particles; VI The connection of sentences. In his later work, which included Vedic syntax,[2] Speyer arranged his material in no more than two chapters: 'Satzteile' and 'Satzbau'. Delbrück on the other hand judiciously started from the principle that the sentence structure should be at the basis of syntactic disquisitions. Hence, I The simple sentence, its clauses, word groups and the order of its words; II The syntax of the word groups and word classes (concord; use of verbal forms etc.); III Particular sentence forms (interrogations etc.); complex sentences. The insight that the text of an utterance is made up of sentences—whether complete or incomplete, simple, compound or complex—arranged according to the structural rules of the language and that therefore no quotation should ever be made for syntactic purposes unless the passage quoted has been examined in context, should guide all workers in this field.

It is a matter for regret that in part of the handbooks—concurring in this with the traditional Indian grammars[3]—this chapter is up to the present day somewhat neglected: in Macdonell's Vedic Grammar there is no section on syntax,[4] and the sixteen pages on sentence structure in Thumb-Hauschild's Handbuch (after ± 580 pages on phonology and morphology) are quite insufficient.[5] It may be true that, for practical and didactic purposes, Sanskrit syntax impresses us as comparatively simple and that even its more complex predications do not attain the complexities familiar in Latin, it has typical syntactical patterns and many other peculiarities of its own which may easily be overlooked by those who proceed, either along the lines of traditional school grammar or from pre-

[1] J. S. Speyer, Sanskrit Syntax, Leyden 1886.
[2] Speyer, Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax, Strassburg 1896.
[3] Wüst, Indisch, p. 107 ff.
[4] In contradistinction to his Vedic grammar for students.
[5] At p. 422 a short bibliography is furnished.

conceived ideas of some theory of general linguistics.[1] So the opinion expressed by Debrunner[2] that after the fundamental work achieved by Delbrück a new historical syntax of Old Indian is no project of special urgency, cannot be subscribed to without reservation. A revision of the existing books and articles on Sanskrit syntax carried out in accordance with modern principles would be no superfluity.[3]

The studies devoted, in the course of the last century, to the functions of the nominal case forms are of different types.[4] They either deal with one particular case, describing its uses—in Old Indian alone or, comparatively, in some of the old Indo-European languages—comprehensively or focussing attention on some peculiarity hitherto unnoticed, or make, to a certain extent, an attempt to delineate their mutual relations and to penetrate the system they form in their entirety.[5]

One of the earliest studies of the first kind, Gaedicke's Accusativ,[6] after dealing with this case in Indo-European in general, discussed his material exhaustively and very systematically, distinguishing in section I ('Constructionsarten') the accusative of object or result, the temporal accusative etc. and in section II ('Arten der beiden Satzteile') the classes of words occurring in the governing and governed 'member of the sentence'. There is an abundance of useful observations and the applicability of the accusative in its various functions is well defined, but the rational ground for, and appropriateness of, these classifications are not called in question; no attempt is made to comprehend the case as such, as an indivisible syntactic unit. While, therefore, a striking characteristic of most of these studies—including many of Delbrück's[7]—is the presentation of the pertinent facts in the traditional form of a classified enumeration of syntagmata and lexical or referential uses,[8] some other works—among them those of

---

[1] See my review of R. Harweg, Kompositum und Katalysationstext vornehmlich im späten Sanskrit, The Hague 1964, in Linguistics, 27 (1966), p. 120 ff.

[2] Wackernagel (-Debrunner), Grammatik, II, 2, Vorwort, p. VI.

[3] I do not consider it part of my task to make mention in this chapter of more or less isolated syntactic curiosities, even if they have attracted much attention (e.g. the famous *sū́re duhitā́* of RV. 1, 34, 5, recently discussed by M. A. Mehendale, B.D.C.R.I. 25, p. 71 ff.).

[4] The distinction once made between grammatical and local functions can remain undiscussed.

[5] O. Wecker, in B.B. 30, p. 1 ff.; 177 ff. arrived at the conclusion that the use of the cases in the earlier upaniṣads conforms to Pāṇini's rules; cf. also B. Liebich, in B.B. 10, p. 205 ff.; 11, p. 273 ff.

[6] C. Gaedicke, Der Accusativ im Veda, Breslau 1880.

[7] See e.g. Delbrück, Altindische Syntax, passim.

[8] It is interesting to notice that the pseudo-problems connected with the assumption of an 'historical' order of the uses were also discussed in Indian antiquity. For instance, those who, judging from its name, considered the dative to be essentially (and originally) the case accompanying verbs of 'giving' were justly criticized by Patañjali (probably ± 150 B.C.) who urged that the dative is also used in sentences such as "A gives B a slap on his face".

Speyer—show a tendency to hierarchical classification which may be suggestive of historical developments. Equivocal occurrences were, more or less consciously, explained as transitions, for instance from the sociative instrumental to the instrumentalis instrumenti.[1]

A later stage in the studies of the syntax of cases is represented by the solid and accurate investigations of Oertel[2] which, based on an abundance of factual data and often enriched with copious notes and digressions, presented new views on many details hitherto unnoticed. Aiming at completeness his publications are essentially descriptive, showing the relative frequency of the phenomena and the peculiarities exhibited by the syntactic usage of single groups of texts. Taking the line that each genre of literature deserves separate and detailed treatment, he purposely avoided any historical and comparative discussion, although it "seemed worth while to note the beginnings of certain constructions, no matter whether they led ... to established usage or whether their development was arrested".[3] No attempt was made to determine 'basic meanings' ('Grundbegriffe') for any case.

The pertinent problems were, after a few decenniads, viewed from a different angle in a series of articles by the present author,[4] who argued that in those many cases in which a plurality of functions of one and the same nominal case form already exists in our oldest sources, any discussion of historical or pre-historical priority is apt to become speculative. Being convinced that many of the different functions traditionally assumed for various grammatical categories are based on time-honoured, half-logical, half-linguistic categories and speculations of a long succession of philosophers and philologists, he proposed to focus attention on the problem as to how to comprehend the very essence and character of the nominal cases in a manner free from traditional classifications and prejudices and on the question as to whether it is possible to detect a unity of the functions of each case and to explain the traditional distinctions in the light of a hypothesis with regard to this unity. Moreover, he endeavoured to show that the Sanskrit cases constitute a coherent system.

The Indian grammarians, while numbering the other cases from 1 to 7, understood very well that the vocative is syntactically widely different from these. They gave this 'case'—which only in the singular and in part

---

[1] Delbrück, o.c., p. 126.

[2] H. Oertel, The syntax of cases in the narrative and descriptive prose of the Brāhmaṇas (I. The disjunctive use of cases), Heidelberg 1926 and the publications mentioned in the following notes and bibliographies. For classified lists of forms: Sukumar Sen, in A.B.O.R.I. 9, p. 33 ff.; 91 ff.; 10, p. 45 ff.; 219 ff.

[3] Oertel, o.c., p. XII.

[4] See the following notes.

of the stem classes is formally distinct from the nominative, and then is not characterized by a special case ending—names after its functions. The vocative is a syntactic unit by itself, which may precede—not begin, as is usually said—a sentence and then is, in the Veda, accented, or without accent interrupts it. In the later case it often follows an imperative, pronoun of the 2nd person etc. Incidentally, the predicate of a verb of "calling oneself" is in the vocative (ŚB. 3, 3, 4, 19, *gaútama bruvāṇa* "O thou who callest thyself Gautama"). The existence of an inherited vocative of an adjective and the explanation of the avoidance of a pair of vocatives connected by *ca* (ṚV. 1, 2, 5) are disputed.[1] Anyhow, the nominative was preferred in various cases where we would at first sight expect a vocative.[2]

The nominative—one of the stepchildren of those writing on syntax[3]— was very incompletely and inadequately characterized by Delbrück[4] as the case of the "den Träger oder Mittelpunkt der Handlung bildenden Substantivbegriffes". The opinion that this was the only original use of this case can hardly be substantiated.[5] Its so-called disjunctive occurrences[6] comprising the proleptic nominative followed by a resumptive demonstrative pronoun agreeing in gender and number with the predicate noun; the pendent nominative[7] anticipating an oblique case; and the absolute nominative[8] must have been widespread already in the prehistoric period and there is no reason to deny this for the nominative of the name quoted, for the nominative of the thema, of that used in enumerations, indications of measure, 'disjunct' appositions etc. Yet, Pāṇini (2, 3, 46) already understood that "the first case is used if nothing else is to be expressed than the mere sense of the nominal base, gender, measure and number", other Indian grammarians condensing this definition into "the nominative expresses only the meaning of the nominal stem". This is true.[9] It can be either isolated or 'complementary' or also 'predicative', but these syntactic differences do not affect its fundamental character. Constructions such as ṚV. 10, 85, 3 *sómam manyate papiván* "he believes he has drunk soma", may be considered to have originated in "he believes: 'having drunk'", such as ṚV 10, 108, 10 *gókāmā me achadayan*, "they

---

[1] Gonda, On nominatives joining or 'replacing' vocatives, Lingua, 6, p. 89 ff.; cf. also R. Loewe, in K.Z. 55, p. 38 ff.; A. B. Keith, in J.R.A.S. 1908, p. 1124 ff.

[2] Cf. Gonda, ibidem; R. Zwolanek, Vấyav índraś ca, MSS. Beiheft 5 (1970).

[3] Speyer, Sanskrit syntax, pays no attention to it.

[4] Delbrück, Vergl. Syntax, I, p. 188.

[5] Gonda, Defining the nominative, Lingua, 5, p. 288 ff.

[6] W. Havers, in I.F. 43, p. 207 ff.; Oertel, in Festschrift—J. Wackernagel, Göttingen 1924, p. 45 ff.; the same, Syntax of cases, p. 10 ff.

[7] Cf. also W. Havers, in I.F. 43, p. 207 ff.; the same, in Glotta, 16, p. 94 ff.

[8] Cf. also F. Weller, in Mitt. Inst. Orientforschung, 3, 2, Berlin 1955, p. 272 ff.

[9] They understood that the other cases express something more.

seemed to me desirous of cows" in "they seem to me: 'desirous of cows'".

Many specialists in ancient Indo-European languages—among them Whitney[1]—were of the opinion that it is impossible to discover one single basic function of the accusative[2] or to arrange its "widely different functions" into a harmonious system.[3] They usually limit themselves to enumerations of these functions,[4] suggesting, by the order of the arrangement, a chronological development or a logical hierarchy.[5] Others, unsatisfied by this situation, tried to reduce the difficulties by the assumption that two or even three cases had coalesced to survive in the historical accusative.[6] However, all this vagueness and scepticism does not seem to be necessary. Gaedicke's[7] and Delbrück's negative method of defining the accusative, viz. "it is used to express all those relations which do not require the other cases" should, to be fruitful, be complemented by a systematic arrangement of the functions of the other cases and the determination of the relation of the accusative to each of them and its position within the whole system. Then it seems to be warranted to say that the casus obliqui are, in their entirety, opposed to the nominative and to understand the ancient Indian accusative as the case which in opposition to the other casus obliqui expresses an unspecified or unqualified relation of a noun or pronoun to a verb or another noun.[8] If the accusative is alone in expressing a relation between two ideas, this relation by itself is vague, general, indeterminate. When there are concurrent idioms containing one or more of the other oblique cases, the accusative is characterized by not expressing that special idea which is conveyed by the others.[9] The various classes of accusatives (of space, time, aim, implied or external objects etc.) traditionally distinguished are in fact closely connected with the different contents of the ideas expressed by the verb. If however there

---

[1] Whitney, in A.J.P. 13, p. 290.

[2] It would be beyond the scope of this work to discuss the identity in form of nominative and accusative in the dual and in the singular of the "genre inanimé" (A. Meillet, in M.S.L. 22, p. 49 ff.).

[3] For an accusative of relation see Brugmann, in I.F. 27, p. 121 ff. For *nāma* "by name" as an original predicative nominative ibidem, p. 143 f.

[4] E.g. Thumb, Handbuch, I, p. 159 ff.

[5] Cf. also Macdonell, Vedic gr. f. stud., p. 299 ff.

[6] Cf. H. Jacobsohn, in Festschrift—Wackernagel, p. 207; Hirt, IdG. Grammatik, VI, p. 86.

[7] Gaedicke, o.c. (see e.g. p. 22); Delbrück, Altindische Syntax, p. 164; Vergl. Syntax, I, p. 187.

[8] This definition is fundamentally different from the mistaken opinion expressed by Whitney (A.J.P. 13, p. 286): "each (case) takes those relations which the others do not take".

[9] Gonda, The character of the Sanskrit accusative, Miscelánea homenaje—A. Martinet, La Laguna 1957, p. 47 ff.; The functions of the accusative, Felicitation Volume—S. K. Belvalkar, Banaras 1957, p. 72 ff.

exists a rival construction, the accusative can easily be understood in a sense opposite, in some way or other, to that of the other case.

Thus the dative accompanying verbs of movement expresses the purpose for which the action is performed, the agent's intention to reach the aim etc. (a sacrifice is performed *svargāya* if one has in view to go "to heaven"); the accusative is free from this implication, expressing by itself only that the scope or extent of the process is fixed or delimited by the nominal idea, without however excluding the alternative. The existence of a similar relation between accusative and locative (ṚV. 6, 48, 6 *dhāvate divi* "he runs to the sky to be there or so as to arrive there", in TS. 5, 5, 5, 4 *suvargáṃ lokám ajigāṃsan* "they sought to go to the world of heaven", no opinion is offered on this implication)[1] was unjustly denied.[2] That is to say, as soon as there is a rival construction, there is the possibility of differentiation.[3] When two cases are, for a certain period, in competition, one of them may tend to oust the other from part of its province. In the oldest texts "to speak to" is almost generally accompanied by the dative, which in Vedic yields slowly to the accusative—in ancient use with verbs of naming or calling—which in the Ṛgveda occurs rarely and in later Sanskrit is normal.[4]

The locative may generally be defined as the case denoting the domain or sphere (in German "Bereich") in which something is or a process takes place, or to which it is directed.[5] Hence also constructions such as *priyá-* and *ratá-* + loc. "dear to somebody", "devoted to, delighting in something", the *nimittasaptamī* (locative of 'motive'),[6] etc. It is a matter of indifference whether or not the idea expressed by the locative is actually affected by the process: ŚB. 1, 8, 1, 7 *saṃvatsaré yoṣít sám babhūva* "at the end of a year (notice this special contextual function[7]) a woman was born". According to context and verb it admits of a considerable variety of uses, but cannot be said to embrace as "un cas circonstantiel par excellence" all other cases; nor does it owe its flexibility as a rival case to a

---

[1] Cf. Delbrück, Altindische Syntax, p. 122, and see also Gaedicke, o.c., p. 129. For other possibilities of 'competition' between these cases: Oertel, Kasusvariationen in der vedischen Prosa, München Academy 1937, 8, who is right in saying that there is no hard-and-fast line between syntactic and stylistic 'variation'.

[2] By H. Willman—Grabowska, Le locatif dans le Rigveda, Thesis Paris 1928.

[3] See e.g. Oertel, o.c., p. 39; 49 ff.; 83 ff.

[4] Hopkins, in J.A.O.S. 28, p. 374 ff.

[5] The question as to whether the locative of the aim is a special 'branch' of the general locative (M. Holzman, in Festschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft 10 (1878), p. 182 ff.) is no longer topical. Delbrück, who was unwilling to commit himself in regard to "original meanings", is silent about this in his time much disputed point! (Altindische Syntax, p. 121).

[6] Speyer, Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax, p. 22.

[7] Cf. Oertel, in München Acad. 1937, 8; incorrectly, Renou, in B.S.L. 42, II, p. 57.

long evolution leading to the loss of its original function.[1] Although it often is accompanied by an indeclinable word, the inherited sole locative is perfectly retained. In the oldest corpus the absolute locative is not yet very frequent.[2] Retarding the development of complex sentences it considerably adds to the conciseness of the style.

Several scholars were inclined to concur in the view held by Wackernagel[3] that of the two 'values' of the genitive distinguished by Meillet,[4] viz. the 'concrete' function (partitive) and the grammatical value as the complement of a substantive—which was considered an anomaly[5]—the former must have been the older and most important. In olden times the range of applications of the adnominal genitive was not very wide[6] because the use of a possessive adjective, often retained in classical Sanskrit, was very common.[7] In the course of time its applicability was limited by the increasing predilection for compounds,[8] which are however avoided if the numerus of the first member should be made explicit (ŚB. 1, 3, 3, 17). On the other hand it considerably encroached on the dative:[9] the possessive genitive would be re-interpreted as equivalent with the dativus commodi. A similar shift from an adnominal (possessive) to an adverbal value led to the genitivus pro ablativo in connection with verba separationis[10] (TS. 3, 4, 8, 6 *annādyam evāsya harati* "he takes his food" > "he deprives him of his food"), although the originally possessive character is not always evident. In technical contexts the thing possessed is often left unexpressed.[11] The beginnings of the absolute genitive—to a certain extent a question of definition—provoked some controversial discussion. It is almost absent in Vedic texts[12] and is in its use mainly limited to a

---

[1] Thus Willman—Grabowska, o.c., p. 112.

[2] Delbrück, Ablativ Localis Instrumentalis ..., Berlin 1867, p. 43.

[3] Wackernagel, in Mélanges—F. de Saussure, Paris 1908, p. 125 ff. (= Kleine Schriften, p. 1346 ff.).

[4] A. Meillet, in Festschrift—V. Thomsen, Leipzig 1912, p. 21 ff. The fundamental force of the genitive was deliberately left out of consideration in Delbrück's Altindische Syntax, p. 151.

[5] A. Sommerfelt, in B.S.L. 23, p. 18.

[6] Wackernagel, l.c.

[7] N. Stchoupak, Le complément du nom dans le Śatapathabrāhmaṇa, M.S.L. 21, p. 1 ff.; Oertel, in K.Z. 62, p. 145 ff.

[8] See also K. H. Schmidt, in I.F. 66, p. 10 ff.

[9] Oertel, in Sitzungsb. München 1939, 6; and ibidem 1937, 8; the same in K.Z. 62, p. 145 ff.; Renou, in B.S.L. 42, II, p. 56. For the competition between the 'sympathetic' dative and possessive constructions, among them genitives: W. Havers, Untersuchung zur Kasussyntax, Strassburg 1911.

[10] Oertel, ibidem 1935, 12 (see p. 34) and ibidem 1938, 6. Cf. also *varuṇād (varuṇasya) ... vīryam apākrāmat* "from (of) Varuṇa his virility went away".

[11] Keith, Veda of the Black Yajus School, p. CLII f.

[12] E. Siecke, De genitivi in lingua sanscritica imprimis vedica usu, Berlin 1869, p. 67; Gaedicke, o.c., p. 47 f.; F. de Saussure, De l'emploi du génitif absolu en sanscrit, Thesis

series of formulas. However, instances do exist of genitives to which an accompanying participle gives, in greater or less degree, a certain syntactical independence, constructions which are justly regarded as the germs out of which the absolute use has developed.[1]

That the sociative function of the instrumental[2] is more essential and fundamental,[3] the instrumental secondary was already understood by Delbrück.[4] The instrumentalis temporis and spatii[5] must have originated in sentences denoting time or space, 'sociatively', as attendants (cf. *sākám* in the sense of "simultaneously, along with"). In combination with preterite participles etc. the originally adnominal genitives compete with it as a casus agentis;[6] there are dubious or 'transitional' instances such as ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 9 f. In Vedic prose the instrumental occurs when the verbal form is without a copula, the genitive in case it is accompanied by *bhavati*.[7]

Although the dative[8] is not the most complex and intricate of cases, there has been much difference of opinion about its central or most essential character.[9] Arguing that it is the case of "that toward or in the direction of or in order to or for which anything is or is done", Whitney[10] added, in the traditional way, a number of uses, which however were limited to two—concern or interest and purpose—by Speyer[11] and—"l'attribution

---

Leipzig 1881 (= Recueil, p. 269 ff.); Oertel, Syntax of cases, p. 101 ff.; Willman—Grabowska, in B.S.O.S. 8, p. 969 ff. (studying "transitional cases").

[1] For the genitive with subjectless verbs or depending on presupposed words: Oertel, in K.Z. 67, p. 129 ff.; 68, 61 ff.; for *iśvara*- "able to, capable of, liable to" with the genitives in *-tos* or *-as*—which should not be called infinitives—the same, K.Z. 65, p. 55 ff.: this construction, which is foreign to the oldest Veda (cf. the speculative remarks by J. Vendryes, in M.S.L. 16, p. 247 ff.), hardly spread over similar adjectives. For other particulars: Oertel in Volume of Eastern and Indian studies—F. W. Thomas, Bombay 1939, p. 160 ff.

[2] H. Wenzel, Der Instrumentalis im Rigveda, Tübingen 1879. For some thoughts on the possibility of complications due to haplology: G. Cardona, On haplology in Indo-European, Philadelphia 1968.

[3] Hence also its occurrence with verbs of "ruling" (not convincingly F. Edgerton in A.J.P. 35, p. 435 f.).

[4] Delbrück, Ablatif ..., p. 50. His treatment of this subject in Altindische Syntax, p. 122 ff. is not too lucid.

[5] See e.g. Speyer, Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax, p. 13. The extent of space or time was no doubt conceived 'sociatively'; translations such as "upon a path, by a path" lead to misunderstanding. On *divā* "by day", opposed to *naktam* "by night" Gonda, in Commemoration Volume—J. Nobel, New Delhi 1963, p. 71 and Meillet, in M.S.L. 28, p. 238, who goes too far in ascribing this difference in case form exclusively to a different valuation of day and night by semi-primitives.

[6] Oertel, München Acad. 1939, 6, p. 12 ff.; 63 ff. Remarks on the spread of the instrumental and the passive voice were made by E. V. Arnold, in J.A.O.S. 18, p. 348.

[7] For the use as an adverb: J. Zubatý, in I.F. 3, p. 119 ff.

[8] Cf. also E. W. Hopkins, in J.A.O.S. 28, p. 360 ff.

[9] The discussion of the question as to whether the dative is a 'local' or a 'grammatical' case (Delbrück, in K.Z. 18, p. 81 ff.; Gaedicke, o.c., p. 137 ff.; Delbrück, Altindische Syntax, p. 140) is no longer relevant.

[10] Whitney, Grammar, p. 95.

[11] Speyer, Sanskrit Syntax, p. 59.

et la destination"—by Renou.[1] A vague general definition —"the notion
with which an action is concerned"—was attempted by Macdonell[2] to in-
troduce a distinction of datives in a special and datives in general sense,
and by Speyer[3]—"the dative points out the destination"—who however,
in his later book,[4] whilst abandoning any attempt to give one comprehen-
sive definition, preferred to view the functions of this case in a historical
perspective: originally a to-and-for case it developed into the dative of
the person ('receiver' or 'destinee') and the dative of purpose.[5] This as-
sertion was rightly qualified as merely conjectural by the Indian scholar
Siddheshwar Varma,[6] who, on the other hand, regarded the dative as
'Wohincasus' a later stage of development, because, he argued, it is, in the
Ṛgveda, comparatively rare, the accusative of aim or direction being
much more frequent in connection with verbs of movement. It seemed to
him "as if the dative of purpose was the original dative par excellence",
and he did not fail to recall that Pāṇini (1, 4, 32), in explaining the 'dative
relation' between a (verbal) process and a noun, had already defined the
latter as referring to "him who (that which) is intended or aimed at" by
the former. One should not however confuse the essential character of a
grammatical entity in a given historical period and its 'original function'
which belongs to the realm of hypothetical argumentation. In substan-
tial agreement with Pāṇini and the Indian tradition the present author[7]
suggested to reduce all classes of datives—and the two main divisions
distinguished by Renou—to one 'Gesamtfunktion', and to define this as
the expression of the idea of "the object in view". This "object in view"
may be double: sentences of the type ṚV. 5, 31, 4 *índram ... ávardhayann*
áhaye hántavā u "they strengthened Indra with hymns to slay the serpent"
or ṚV. 8, 67, 12 *tokáya jīváse* "that our offspring will live"[8] are not, with

---

[1] Renou, Grammaire sanscrite, p. 296.

[2] Macdonell, Vedic gr. f. stud., p. 310.

[3] Speyer, o.c., p. 58.

[4] Speyer, Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax, p. 13.

[5] In cases such as ṚV. 7, 77, 1 Chr. Bartholomae, in I.F. 10, p. 189 ff. incorrectly spoke of
infinitives. The question as to whether such a so-called infinitive is active or passive
(V. M. Apte, in B.D.C.R.J. 1957, p. 6 ff.) is a pseudo-problem, because the noun is indif-
ferent to diathesis and the active or passive force is conveyed by other elements of the
sentence. There is no question of an adjectival use (E. Zupitza, in K.Z. 35, p. 461) in ṚV.
5, 44, 2 etc.

[6] S. Varma, Syntax of the dative case in the Ṛgveda, in Jhā Commemoration volume,
Poona 1937, p. 435 ff. (see p. 438). This critical and constructive article was not accessible
to me when I wrote the article mentioned in the next note.

[7] Gonda, The unity of the Vedic dative, in Lingua, 11 (1962), p. 141 ff.

[8] For the datives in -*as-e* (action nouns expressing result, consequence etc.) which are
"in a comparatively loose way added to the sentence" and do not 'govern' other words see
Renou, in New Indian Antiquary, 3, p. 225 ff. These datives do not function as predicates;
thus Geldner's translation of ṚV. 5, 64, 4 needs correcting.

Whitney[1] and other scholars, to be explained as cases of 'attraction'.[2] This function implies a marginal position of the object (thing, person) with regard to that which the sentence states to exist, to be qualified, or to take place. In other words, the 'thing' denoted by a dative exists independently of the process, the existence of an entity or the presence of a quality. Such distinctions as that made between the 'special dative' connected with an individual word, or the 'general dative' complementing the statement of the whole sentence[3] are irrelevant: there is no essential difference in the use of the case between RV. 1, 133, 7 *sunvānáyéndro dadāti ... rayím* "Indra gives wealth to (the man) who presses" and RV. 1, 15, 12 *devân devayaté yaja* "worship the gods for the benefit of the one who wants to approach them". Whether the object in view is attained or not is irrelevant, the Indian authorities observing quite appositely that the dative is to denote "the being intended for that" (*tādarthye*): *yūpāya dāru* "wood for (in order to make) a sacrificial post"; *edhebhyo vrajati* "he goes for fuel". Hence phrases such as *darśanāya cakṣuh* "the eye is to see"; "the bird bears itself to its nest" (*saṃlayāya*); *bhuvad vīryāya* "he came to power".[4] A special use is the sympathetic dative, especially frequent in the ancient period, which had its main starting-point in personal pronouns where it largely 'replaces' possessives.[5] Here also, the character of the form becomes especially clear when there exist parallel constructions with another case: RV. 10, 128, 2 *máhyaṃ vâtaḥ pavatāṃ kâme* "let the wind blow for me at my desire"; AV. 5, 3, 3 *m. v. p. kâmāya* "... unto my desire"[6]; *anāgas-* with dative "sinless to", with locative "sinless with (before)".[7]

The remarkable fact that the ablative is the only case without a special ending in the plural and, except in the thematic class (*r̥tâd*), also in the singular where the ending (*-d/t*) is common to nouns and pronouns, led scholars to draw the conclusion that it originally was confined to one nominal class (the *-e/o-* stems) and that this had borrowed it from the pronouns.[8] Elaborating this hypothesis in a somewhat speculative argument Hopkins[9] tried to demonstrate the superfluity of this case: "its

---

[1] Whitney, Sanskrit grammar, p. 352.

[2] Gonda, in B.S.O.A.S. 20, p. 279 ff. The term 'attraction' is often misused, see e.g. Th. Simenschy, La construction du verbe dans les langues indo-européennes, Jassy 1949 (cf. Gonda, Lingua, 4, p. 99 ff.).

[3] Macdonell, o.c., p. 310; 314.

[4] Hopkins, in T.A.P.A. 37, p. 87 ff.—There is no dativus agentis in instances such as RV. 1, 75, 4 (as was assumed by Delbrück, Altindische Syntax, p. 396); see Hopkins, in J.A.O.S. 28, p. 371 ff.

[5] Havers, o.c., p. 323 etc.

[6] Cf. also Hopkins, in J.A.O.S. 28, p. 360.

[7] Hopkins, ibidem, p. 367.

[8] Cf. Hirt, IdG. Grammatik, VI, p. 41 f. (with a bibliography).

[9] Hopkins, The origin of the ablative case, J.A.O.S. 38, p. 47 ff. See p. 57: "Stem and

various functions are represented well enough by dative, genitive, and instrumental (in some cases by locative)". However, he depended too much upon the functions of the adverbs in *-taḥ* considering this in all respects to be "an alternative ablative ending".[1] It is quite true that *-taḥ (-tas)* ($<$ I.E. *-tos*) does not only indicate "the place from which", but also "the place where" (*savyataḥ* "on the left") and even "the place towards which", but the observations made already by Pāṇini (5, 3, 7) about *-taḥ* show that its sphere of employment is sometimes different from that of the ablative;[2] moreover, the polysemy of *-taḥ* often is a question of orientation: we are accustomed to translate *itas tataḥ* by "hither and thither" (German "hin und her"). It may be true that in the Veda the personal pronominal ablative is almost always accompanied by a directive word (RV. 2, 28, 5 *ví mác chrathaya* "loosen from me"), the conclusion that the function of the ablative, being so weak as to need "strengthening", "appears to be quite unnecessary" is an exaggeration. According to the "old-fashioned attitude toward the cases adopted by Delbrück and Whitney",[3] all ablative phenomena represent either an original or a weakened "from"-force. It would be more correct to follow Pāṇini (1, 4, 24 ff.) who taught that the ablative is the case of the object which remains in its own place when another object is removed from it. The ablativus comparationis, and that accompanying *anya-* "other" etc. commonly given the same name,[4] are explicable from the same fundamental idea ("removing from" $>$ "apart, different from").[5]

From the above argument it may be clear that once the central or nuclear function of a grammatical category has been established, the question as to how to classify its uses—or rather, how to reclassify them, because there is a traditional classification which, like the usual terminology, has proved to be largely untenable—is of secondary importance. Thus, the many possibilities of the dative accompanying adjectives ("kind to, good for, hostile to, ready for" etc.) are merely contextual and situational variations of one and the same general function.

---

ablative of the personal pronouns is one with the stem of the demonstrative as to its final *d* ... Uninflected forms can be used for full cases" and p. 50: "In the personal pronouns there is no ablative form other than the stem".

[1] An incorrect formulation also in W. Caland's article in I.F. 31, p. 105. Cf. also Renou, Grammaire sanscrite, p. 159.

[2] See Speyer, Sanskrit syntax, p. 80 f.

[3] Hopkins, o.c., p. 50. See Delbrück, Altindische Syntax, p. 106 ("derjenige Nominalbegriff, von welchem her die Handlung des Verbums erfolgt"); Whitney, Sanskrit grammar, p. 96.

[4] See e.g. Speyer, Sanskrit syntax, p. 78; 160.

[5] Gonda, Reflections on the numerals, Utrecht 1953, p. 60 ff.

Whereas Pāṇini (1, 4, 21 f.), Whitney[1] and Speyer[2] agreed on the general strictness of the use of the dual "in all cases where two objects are logically indicated, whether directly or by combination" (Whitney), Delbrück[3] made some objections to the supposition that this strictness was also maintained in the older period of the language. His pertinent remarks are not in all respects felicitous because two persons, like a single speaker, may in referring to themselves use the plural (ṚV. 3, 33, 4; cf. Pāṇini 1, 2, 59) or be respectfully addressed in that number (3, 33, 5). Moreover, the hieratic language of the Ṛgveda admits the dual more freely than the Atharvaveda or 'popular speech',[4] but the Veda does not use plurals for duals with any marked freedom, incidental cases of encroachment being "characteristic of the higher reaches of hieratic art".[5] Deviations from the normal use of the number and from numerical concord in metaphors and similes[6] are often due to the requirements of the context or of its mythic symbolism.

Rather than "(the) two ..." or "... as far as it is double"[7] the dual may be said to denote complementary 'two-ness', i.e. entities which constitute an ensemble in the form of a duality, which though being double, two-sided etc. presented themselves or were regarded as a unity.[8] Its existence is explicable from a 'primitive' and archaic predilection for counting pairs and distinguishing 'dualité unité'. The addition of the numeral *dvau* does not only emphasize the number two, but also the completeness of the pair.[9] Later authors continue using this numeral in this way, although it is also used to express the mere idea of "two", e.g. as opposed to "three".[10] Similarly, the often added *ubhau* is "both" referring to two, and no more than two, objects of the same class.

The various phenomena and problems associated with the elliptic dual—which seems to have been inherited[11]—and the dual dvandva[12] gave rise

---

[1] Whitney, Grammar, p. 88 f.

[2] Speyer, Sanskrit syntax, p. 17.

[3] Delbrück, Altindische Syntax, p. 100 ff.

[4] S. G. Oliphant, The Vedic dual, I, J.A.O.S. 30, p. 155 ff. studying the duality of natural bodily parts (ascribed to an individual, associated with two or more persons) and cases of a plurality of bodily parts, naturally dual, associated with a plurality or duality of persons, or to one single individual.

[5] Oliphant, o.c., p. 184 f.

[6] Oliphant, The (Vedic) dual in similes, J.A.O.S. 35, p. 16 ff.: "when the stress of comparison falls upon the substantive terms of a simile, these terms are in numerical concord" (p. 16).

[7] R. Gauthiot, in Festschrift—V. Thomsen, Leipzig 1912, p. 131 f.

[8] Gonda, Reflections on the numerals 'one' and 'two' in ancient I.E. languages, Utrecht 1953, p. 12.

[9] See above, ch. III, p. 77 f.

[10] Gonda, o.c., p. 21 ff.   [11] A. Debrunner, in Glotta, 15, p. 14 ff.

[12] Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 335 f.; 124 f. For a short review of the hypotheses see

to diametrically differing opinions. Whereas the traditional theory[1] seems to derive the former from the latter, Delbrück[2] and others reverse the process. According to a third view[3] the origins of both modes of expression were completely distinct, the frequent cases of 'syllepsis' *pitárā* and *mātárā* "father and mother" and their analogical extensions accounting for every elliptical dual in Old Indo-Aryan—this supposition may go too far—and the double dualized dvandva (e.g. *indrávárunā* "Indra and Varuna") being a hieratic variant of the normal ancient dvandva compound, which in its turn is understood as an evolution of the asyndetic juxtaposition. This view has something to recommend it, but the development cannot be traced in detail.

Interesting cases of incongruity between sex and genus[4] occur in identifications of objects denoted by words of three genera with masculine or female sex; neuter words are, in principle, incorporated in the category of males.[5]

It is not rarely difficult to draw the dividing line between substantive or adjective, nomen agentis or nomen actionis.[6] Incidentally, an adverb is used as a predicate determining the subject:[7] Pañcaviṃśabrāhmaṇa 5, 8, 9 *sarvam asmai divā bhavati* "all is (as clear as) day for him". An unmistakable preference for impersonal constructions (ṚV. I, 30, 12 *táthā tád astu*) may be explained from a tendency not to disturb the normal rules of congruence. Or a nominative singular may in a fixed form function 'adverbially'.[8] Combinations of local adverb and (originally appositive) locative are not foreign to the related languages.[9] Sometimes an adjective is preferred where we would have expected an adverb.[10] That those adverbs which originally were case-forms of nominal or pronominal stems continued to attract attention[11] was no more than the consequence of the reconsideration of the fundamental functions of the cases. Some of these adverbs

---

P. H. Salus, in Orbis, 12 (1963), p. 551 ff., whose solution of the problem (analogous influence of the type *devam-devam*) cannot claim finality.

[1] Followed, e.g., by Wackernagel, in K.Z. 23, p. 309.

[2] Delbrück, Altindische Syntax, p. 98; Renou, o.c., p. 124.

[3] S. G. Oliphant, in J.A.O.S. 32 (1912), p. 33 ff.

[4] Speyer, Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax, p. 3 f. Questions of motion (cf. Chr. S. Stang, in Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap, 17 (1954), p. 129 ff.) cannot be considered here.

[5] Oertel, Widersprüche zwischen grammatischem Genus und Sexus, München Acad. 1943, 7. See also Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 336 f.

[6] Cf. also Renou, La phrase védique, in Symbolae linguisticae—G. Kuryłowicz, Wrocław 1965, p. 230 ff.

[7] Not (Debrunner, in I.F. 46, p. 182) as a nominative. See K. Hoffmann, in M.S.S. 1, p. 42 ff.

[8] Brugmann, in I.F. 27, p. 256 f. (cf. ṚV. 7, 3, 1).

[9] E. Kieckers, in I.F. 42, p. 329.

[10] Gonda, in Journal of Oriental Research, Madras 24, p. 1 ff., where also on enallage.

[11] Gonda, in Commemoration Volume—J. Nobel, New Delhi 1963, p. 67 ff.

reflecting ancient and comparatively pure functions of definite cases are helpful in solving the pertinent problems.

The seemingly redundant use of a pronoun of the 1st and 2nd person as subject,[1] often explained as emphatic,[2] is indeed, irrespective of chronology, frequently added in a variety of affective or more or less 'colloquial' utterances. Hence also its frequency in connection with definite verbs, in negative sentences *(nāham ...)* and interrogations such as ṚV. 10, 95, 2 *kím etá vācá kṛṇavā távāhám* "why should I speak such words to you?" illustrating also the tendency to emphatic juxtaposition. The pronoun *tvam* tends to accompany an imperative to express kind, polite or emphatic insistence; in sentences of a certain length this extra indication of the subject is comparatively often used as a 'point of support'. In cases such as *dade 'ham* the pronoun may have been added for the sake of clearness: "I (not he) give". Like some enclitic pronouns of the 2nd person in other languages *vaḥ* tends, initially after a preverb, to assume the character of a particule; it goes too far to take it[3] to function as a nominative.

The function of the pronoun *asau*—unequally distributed over the texts, preferring stereotyped phrases and after the brāhmaṇas tending to become defective—appears to be inadequately described in the Indian and Occidental manuals ("applied to objects absent or remote from the speaker").[4] It points, it is true, to heaven, the gods, the remote, but also to the addressed person (as opposed to the speaker) and is used in opposition to other pronouns (AV. 9, 4, 6 *yá imáḥ ... yá amúḥ*) and may therefore be said to be pronouncedly deictic and especially suited to underline an opposition.[5]

Many authors of grammars[6] still cling to the time-honoured practice of teaching that it is the interrogative which combining with certain particles assumes an indefinite force. Criticizing the attempts to construct an historical relation to both functions of the I.E. $k^u i$- and $k^u o$- pronouns the present author[7] argued that these pronouns 'originally' and essentially expressed the idea of unspecified individuality and had their special functions only in their syntactic surroundings—position in the sentence, accentua-

---

[1] Gonda, in A.O. 19, p. 211 ff.

[2] See e.g. Delbrück, Altindische Syntax, p. 30; Speyer, Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax, p. 74.

[3] With G. Liebert, in Lunds Universitets Årsskrift, N.F. 46, 3 (1950), cf. p. 19.

[4] Whitney, Sanskrit grammar, p. 191; Macdonell, Vedic gr. f. stud., p. 293; Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 341 etc.

[5] G. Liebert, Zum Gebrauch der *w*-Demonstrativa im ältesten Indoarischen, Lunds Univ. Årsskrift, N.F. 50, 9 (1954), esp. p. 78 ff.

[6] See e.g. Renou, o.c., p. 382; Sukumar Sen, in I.H.Q. 11, p. 135, who is on the other hand right in explaining the pejorative function from the indefinite (*kiṃpuruṣa*- etc.).

[7] Gonda, in Lingua, 4 (1955), p. 241 ff.

tion etc.—: initially interrogative, immediately after the beginning, after a negative particle accentless and indefinite, etc. Thus *kaḥ* in *káś caná*, *nákiḥ* were indefinite before combining with the particle.

Basing himself on his collections of mantra variants Bloomfield[1] tried to show that, in earliest Sanskrit, the use of moods is to such an extent unstable that ideas expressed in a given mood are, on a surprisingly large scale, expressed equally well in another mood, the circumstances under which the two statements are made being precisely the same. It may however be asked, if, and to what extent, the author's intentions were also the same and if Bloomfield was right in ascribing this unstability, "at the most and solely", to an arbitrary change in the appraisal of the original mood. The very nature of the texts is an important factor. For instance, the use of an indicative instead of another mood may find its explanation in the poet's stating something as certain which actually is only wished or hoped for.[2] Anyhow, in translating we should not blur out the distinctions made e.g. in magical texts by rendering imperatives as if they expressed a mere wish.[3]

The theory of the Indo-European and Vedic moods established by Delbrück[4] was, indeed, at least in substance subscribed to by many scholars.[5] Yet, Whitney and others[6] questioned the correctness of his thesis that the difference between subjunctive and optative originally and essentially consisted in a distinction between willing and wishing. Hirt even made an abortive attempt to show that Delbrück's doctrine should be replaced by the hypothesis that the subjunctive originally was a future and that the original function of the optative was to express "das Zeitlose und die Gegenwart".[7] After him Miss Hahn[8] went so far as to develop the untenable thesis that both moods were futures and thus often interchangeable.[9] This is not to contend that the traditional views of the moods—although of course often materialized in a didactically usable form, e.g. "à la 1^re

---

[1] Bloomfield, in A.J.P. 33, p. 1 ff.

[2] Cf. Bloomfield, o.c., p. 8.

[3] Cf. also A. B. Keith, in J.R.A.S. 1909, p. 149 ff.: "The chief syntactic merit of the early brāhmaṇa style is the exact use of both tenses and moods".

[4] B.Delbrück, Syntaktische Forschungen, I, Halle S. 1871, p. 13; IV, Halle S. 1879, p. 117; Vergleichende Syntax, II, p. 302; Neue Jahrb. f. d. klass. Altertum 1871, p. 326; Altindische Syntax, p. 302 ff.

[5] Cf. e.g. Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 369; 371.

[6] Whitney, A.J.P. 13, p. 294; the same, Grammar, p. 217. Cf. also A. Bergaigne, De coniunctivi et optativi ... vi antiquissima, Paris 1877, p. 41 ff.; 57 ff.

[7] H. Hirt, Grammatik, VI, p. 271; 278 ff.; VII, p. 147 ff. For other views see Gonda, Moods, p. 1 ff.

[8] E. A. Hahn, Subjunctive and optative, New York 1953.

[9] Cf. also W. Porzig, in Gnomon, 27 (1955), p. 53 ff.; W. Thomas, in I.F. 65, p. 84 f.; A. Nehring, in Z.D.M.G. 110, p. 183.

pers. ... (le subjonctif) marque la volonté, ou bien l'événement attendu, escompté, tendant vers l'expression d'un futur"[1]—were not in need of radical revision, the more so as many scholars were inclined to transpose the problem offered by the simultaneous existence of a 'cupitive' and a 'potential' function of the optative and a 'voluntative' and 'prospective' function of the subjunctive into questions of chronological priority.[2] The comparative method proper does not however allow us to go beyond the conclusion that this variety of functions was already a feature of prehistoric Indo-European, so that the answers given to these questions were philosophical or ethno-psychological speculations rather than linguistic hypotheses.[3]

In the most recent study of these classes[4] an attempt was made to show that in Old Indian as well as in prehistoric Indo-European the verbal category of mood was a means of intimating the speaker's view or conception of the relation of the process expressed by the verb to reality, the main distinction being between what the speaker puts forward as fact (whether it is objectively true or not) and what he does not regard as such. If he visualizes the process as real or actual, he uses the indicative;[5] if he puts it forward as not or not yet having a higher degree of being than mental existence, one of the two other moods. A process in the subjunctive or optative represents a 'mental image' on the part of the speaker which in his opinion is capable of realization or even awaits realization, the difference being that the optative also expresses 'contingency', that is to say, the optative, being the mood of eventuality, helps the speaker to take the possibility of the non-occurrence of the process into account. Whether, in using a subjunctive, a speaker expects the realization of the process, desires it, fears it, orders or hopes it or whether he merely sees it before his mental eyes is a matter of indifference. Any implication and specialization (wish, adhortation, deliberation, 'anticipation'), and in the case of an

---

[1] Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 369.
[2] See e.g. Brugmann, Grundriss, ²II, 3, p. 857.
[3] The hypothesis that modal particles once fulfilled the function of the moods of the historical period, defended by Miss Hahn and others, is decidedly to be rejected.
[4] Gonda, Moods (this book was first and foremost intended to refute Miss Hahn's theses). Cf. e.g. Nehring, l.c.; L. Zgusta, in Arch. Or. 27, p. 686 ff.; W. Thomas, in Orient. Literaturzeitung, 1957, p. 398 ff.; J. Kuryłowicz, in Kratylos, 1, p. 123 ff.; H. Seiler, ibidem, p. 131 ff.
[5] This mood is characterized by the primary endings, which, in ancient texts, also appear in those subjunctives (see W. Neisser, in B.B. 7, p. 211 ff.), the syntactic value of which approaches that of an indicative (subjunctives expressing general or undetermined thought or being a simple device of subordination; Gonda, Moods, p. 109 ff.). For the tendency of the subjunctive to differentiate from the indicative see Renou, in B.S.L. 33, p. 5; for a not completely convincing morphological hypothesis to explain the relations between these moods: ibidem, p. 13 ff. (Gonda, Moods, p. 113 ff.).

optative,[1] whether it is 'potential', 'general', expressive of some wish or other, depends on context, situation, intonation etc.[2] Thus, as a result of the influence of various factors—context, person,[3] meaning of the verb, etc.—a diversity of usages and idioms had come into existence, in which the use of the moods was more or less closely restricted to a particular function. Thus the 'subsequent' or 'consecutive' subjunctive occurs after an imperative etc. to express the anticipated consequence of the performance of the process denoted by the latter.[4] Being especially apt to express such a 'secondary' process this mood is predominantly used in subordinate clauses.[5]

In the course of the Vedic period the subjunctive, which at first was much more frequent than the optative, came to fall into disuse.[6] In the brāhmaṇas it is already about four times less frequent than in the saṃhitās. Various causes led to this development: first and foremost a weakening of the specific modal functions, the increasing encroachment of the optative (which however is outside the singular rare in Vedic prose), the future[7] and the indicative[8] upon its ancient province; the preference for definite nominal constructions (final dative); then also morphological— the subjunctive stems were complex, part of the endings rhythmically dissimilar[9]—and semantic factors: there was in the three persons and numbers much diversity of function, the 1st person expressing, for instance, in the singular, the speaker's will or intention to accomplish a process, in the other numbers it is adhortative, the other persons being used when the speaker provokes a process to be realized by others. It is true that direct speech which in the ancient prose was the permanent substructure for this mood continued to occur,[10] but it did no longer require special verb

---

[1] For which see Pāṇini 3, 3, 161: "used if it is intended to express an injunction or precept, an invitation, a courteous address implying permission, a wish, an inquiry, a request or solicitation".

[2] See Gonda, o.c., p. 69 ff.; 51 f.—What we call a grammatical category is the result of a generalization by which we endeavour to include in a single idea all that is common to a great variety of individual forms, each of which has its own meaning and usage. For reasons of space no mention can be made of particular, likewise explicable uses, such as the optative of repetition in the past (Benveniste, in M.S.L. 47, p. 11 ff.; Gonda, o.c., p. 64 ff.); for the optative in protasis and apodosis of conditional sentences: Keith, in J.A.O.S. 1909 p. 152 ff.; in comparisons: E. Windisch, in K.Z. 21, p. 286 f.

[3] See e.g. Delbrück, Altindische Syntax, p. 306 ff.

[4] Gonda, Moods, p. 87 ff.

[5] Cf. also Renou, La décadence et la disparition du subjonctif (Monographies Sanskrites, I), Paris 1937, p. 12.

[6] Renou, o.c.

[7] E. W. Hopkins, in A.J.P. 13, p. 1 ff.; Renou, o.c., p. 30 f.

[8] Which in Sanskrit also can be used "pro imperativo" (W. Havers, Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax, Heidelberg 1931, p. 25).

[9] Cf. also Bloch, L'Indo-Aryen, p. 216.

[10] Renou, o.c., p. 29.

forms. At the end of the Vedic period[1] the subjunctive had become so radically extinct, that not even the kāvya poets re-introduced it.[2] Specializing in their 'volitional' function its three first persons survived in the so-called imperative, which it did not yet 'supplement' in the oldest texts. As to the optative, it ousted the subjunctive especially from clauses introduced by *yadi*, *yad* and *yadā*, and partly from interrogations. The optative in "softened statements of what is"[3] is, with a few exceptions, post-Vedic.

That the older grammars, e.g. Whitney's, do not include some paragraphs on aspectual distinctions, is no matter of surprise, because the problems connected with this category did not at that time attract much attention. However, the very fact that Thumb-Hauschild[4] in 1959 repeated the short note on Indo-European aspects printed in the first edition of 1905 without any reference to the problem as to whether this category occurs in Old Indian and the terminological confusion in other comparatively recent works which sometimes do mention the term in a vague way[5] as well as the casual discussion of aspectual problems[6] without using the term, show the elusive character of the grammatical expression, in this language, of the speaker's attitude with regard to non-limitation or limitation, development or non-development, isolation or non-isolation etc. of the process. Whereas some authors[7] ignore the possibility of an aspectual function of Sanskrit verb forms, or are inclined to minimize their importance,[8] others[9] ventured on the hazardous task of penetrating these mysteries without—intelligibly enough—always arriving at the same conclusions. Being first and foremost concerned with the central problem, viz. the relations between the present and aorist, Delbrück[10] had

---

[1] For some particulars, Renou, o.c., p. 40; see also A. Fürst, Der Sprachgebrauch der älteren Upaniṣads, Thesis Tübingen 1915 (K.Z. 47, p. 1 ff.), p. 19 and 59.

[2] For survivals in Middle Indo-Aryan see Renou, o.c., p. 43 f. (with references).

[3] Whitney, Grammar, p. 215.

[4] Thumb-Handbuch, I, 2, p. 190.

[5] Renou, Grammaire sanscrite, p. 137; 396.

[6] E.g. Delbrück, Altindische Syntax, p. 280.

[7] E.g. Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 294 ff. Whitney (A.J.P. 13, p. 289) was wholly mistaken in saying that "all past action is completed action".

[8] W. Thomas, Der Gebrauch der Vergangenheitstempora im Tocharischen, Wiesbaden 1957, p. 8. Translators often were careless of aspectual and temporal distinctions.

[9] G. Buddrusz, Verbalaspekt und Imperativ im Ṛgveda, (unpublished thesis), Frankfurt M. 1954; J. Vekerdi, On past tense and verbal aspect in the Ṛgveda, Acta Orient. Hung. 5 (1955), p. 75 ff.; J. Gonda, The aspectual function of the Ṛgvedic present and aorist, The Hague 1962; T. Ja. Elizarenkova, Aorist v Rigvede, Moscow 1960 (see also the same, On the problem of the development of tenses in Old Indo-Aryan, Proc. 25th Int. Congr. of Orient., Papers U.S.S.R. delegation); K. Hoffmann, Der Injunktiv im Veda, Heidelberg 1967 (in substance conceived before 1951).

[10] Delbrück, Vergleichende Syntax, II, p. 241, 277 ff. etc.

already in 1897, not without reservation,[1] it is true, adopted the theory of verbal aspect as then current in Indo-European linguistics in his description of the Indian facts, stating that the indicative of the aorist "die punktuelle Wurzelhandlung ursprünglich in die Vergangenheit versetzte".[2] Through the intermediary of Brugmann[3] the gist of his observations, in a more dogmatic form, was incorporated in the comparative syntax of the Indo-European languages to remain for many years, in substance, undisputed until recently it was, in a very sceptical article based on a limited number of texts,[4] asserted that in the R̥gveda there is no functional difference between present and aorist either in respect of aspect or in respect of recent and remote past (Zeitstufe). Its author was not alone in stating that both verbal systems are invested now with an aspectual, now with a temporal character.[5]

Concurring in the view that the system of the Old Indo-Aryan verb exhibits traces of an evolution from a less developed grouping of forms than the complex and amply developed system we know from the Veda and that the method of internal reconstruction based on system relation[6] enables us to form an idea of this previous state of affairs, others are, also in consideration of the fact that the present, imperfect and aorist, while being opposed to the perfect by some common features, are incompletely differentiated from one another, under the impression that a thorough interpretation of the pertinent facts brings to light the existence of tendencies to what may be broadly called aspectual distinctions.[7] Whereas some of them[8] subscribe to Delbrück's[9] observation, that in the oldest period the (augmented) imperfect—"unter Aufgabe des imperfektiven Aspekts"[10]—refers to the remote, the (augmented) aorist to the recent (and 'actual') past,[11] a thorough examination of some large collections of text-places[12] seems to show that things are much more complicated. Out-

---

[1] E.g., o.c., p. 239: "Die Aktion des vedischen Aorists lässt sich durch direkte Beobachtung wohl kaum feststellen".
[2] At the time some scholars were biassed by the assumption that the function of aorists in ancient Indo-Iranian must have been identical with that of the Greek aorist.
[3] Brugmann, Grundriss, ^{2}II, 3, p. 748 f.; 760 f.
[4] Vekerdi (see above).
[5] Among them also J. Kuryłowicz, in R.O. 16 (1950-53), p. 531 ff.
[6] See chapter IV, p. 86 f.
[7] See also Renou, in J.A. 1962, p. 308.
[8] Elizarenkova, Problem, p. 7 f.; see also Hoffmann, o.c., p. 272 and 159.
[9] Delbrück, Altindische Tempuslehre (= Synt. Forschungen II), Halle 1876, p. 90; 132.
[10] Hoffmann, l.c.
[11] Cf. also Hoffmann, o.c., p. 270 f. For the aorist of a proximate past in the Kāṭhakasaṃhitā etc.: A.B. Keith, in J.R.A.S. 1909, p. 149 ff.
[12] Gonda, o.c. (for a summary see p. 259 ff.); Hoffmann, o.c.; but see also Delbrück, Altindische Tempuslehre, p. 131.

side the system of the 'Zeitstufen' the indicative of the aorist can state past events and refer to the previous past. It is true that the imperfect is generally speaking the usual form to speak of the mythical past, but the aorist may in narratives or descriptions of mythical or legendary events more or less 'dramatically' alternate with it. When the former signifies processes in a more remote past, these are not infrequently at the same time viewed 'imperfectively'. Although many places are doubtful or far from conclusive, the tendency to distinguish between an 'aoristic' and an 'imperfectic' aspect—though often completely absent, functional neutrality being especially proper to the former category—is indeed unmistakable. In the oldest texts the aorist refers too often to special cases, single details, isolated occurrences, is too often used in connection with processes which, though durative in nature, are viewed without regard to duration to be regarded as merely and purely temporal in character. It may state a bald fact at its psychologically most relevant moment, or indicate that a process has reached its close, it may be 'complexive' or 'recapitulative'. It can also denote isolated or momentary occurrences taking place while a process signified by an imperfect is going on. On the other hand, the imperfect often emphasizes the idea of development or continuance, or expresses variety, frequency, heterogeneity, perspective, simultaneity; it helps to suggest that a process which took place in the past persists in its results and consequences.[1] Both categories may, each in their own way, occur in contexts implying frequency, repetition or iteration. The use of the archaic injunctive does not seem to contradict these conclusions: it is, for instance, no mere coincidence that it is the aoristic injunctive[2] which occurs "in der resultativen Konstatierung, dem Koinzidenzfall und der Ankündigung einer unmittelbar bevorstehenden Handlung";[3] when this form denotes a repeated process, the single acts are, as a rule, not represented as durative.[4]

At first the perfect[5] occupied a position of its own, belonging, in all probability, to an older verbal system in which it was a member of a non-temporal system of oppositions. In the oldest texts it digresses from the system of tense oppositions in that sometimes it is together with the present opposed to the aorist and the imperfect as a present, or more ex-

---

[1] Attempts were made to demonstrate the existence of different 'aspectual' functions of the present classes, especially of the nasal present: see F. B. J. Kuiper, Die indogermanischen Nasalpräsentia, Amsterdam 1937, p. 202 ff.

[2] In connection with the injunctive one should avoid speaking with Renou (Symbolae linguisticae—Kuryłowicz, p. 232) of "la création d'une forme hybride".

[3] Hoffmann, o.c., p. 270.

[4] Hoffmann, o.c., p. 274.

[5] See chapter IV, p. 100 ff.

actly as expressive of a state, but in other cases it is together with the aorist and the imperfect opposed to the present as a past tense. That is to say, the 'stative' character ("l'état acquis ou l'acte accompli")[1] comes, in the Ṛgveda, much to the fore, especially when its forms occupy a more or less isolated position. It seems that those hymns in which the perfect is not only comparatively rare but also used in this more 'original' way are among the oldest.[2] Especially under the influence of a 'narrative context' and the widespread tendency to represent, 'dramatically' and 'anticipatorily', events which in reality are or were not accomplished as such, as 'faits accomplis', as states or results,[3] it may however, to denote a statement, recapitulation etc., assume the younger function of a preterit.[4] Whereas in the latter case the alternation between perfect and imperfect is, in the hymns, as a rule motivated, the authors of the prose texts, which were gradually invaded by this narrative use, like their successors writing classical Sanskrit, came to use the forms indiscriminately. When in the later Veda the flection of the perfect is 'normalized', its various forms conform in function to those of the other verbal stems; its indicative, the only surviving mood, becomes a historical tense, the old stative resultative value—which in the brāhmaṇa-portions of the Taittirīya-Saṃhitā is proper to one third of the cases[5]—occurring in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa in no more than 25 cases (of 1915), and being extinct in the Chāndogya-Upaniṣad.[6] Two particulars are remarkable, however: the perfect often begins a statement or an exposition which is continued by an imperfect;[7] it is avoided in references to personal experience. In the course of time the relative frequency of all preterits comes almost entirely to depend on the literary genre and considerations of style.[8]

　　The Old Indo-Aryan pluperfect,[9] being of recent origin and produced

[1] Renou, La valeur du parfait (p. 101, n. 1), p. 190. Cf. also A. Margulies, in K.Z. 57, p. 202 ff.; Delbrück, Altindische Tempuslehre, p. 101 ff.; the same, Vergleichende Syntax, II, p. 217; 269 f.; Hoffmann, o.c., p. 160.

[2] Renou, o.c., p. 192.

[3] Cf. also Renou, o.c., p. 41.

[4] "Cette valeur s'est manifestée surtout dans des formules d'un type plus ou moins rigide, qui fournissent les cadres de la narration mythique des hymnes" (Renou, o.c., p. 191).

[5] A. B. Keith, The Veda of the Black Yajus School, Cambridge Mass. 1914, I, p. LXXII f.; CLIII f.

[6] Whitney, in T.A.P.A. 23, p. 28 ff. For the later period (veda and āha as preterito-presents) see Speyer, Sanskrit Syntax, p. 246 f.

[7] "Il semble que dans les textes classiques en général le parfait soit choisi de préférence pour marquer les étappes essentielles du récit ou pour mettre en valeur les descriptions colorées" (Renou, p. 186).

[8] Cf. Pāṇini, 3, 4, 6!

[9] See ch. IV, p. 102 f.

by the tendency to create symmetric forms, is not functionally opposed to the other forms which refer to the past.

Not different from Greek, the middle perfects are clearly secondary so that expressing a situation or state of affairs we find *papāda* beside the present *padyate* "to fall, resort to".[1] There are also instances of intransitively used active and middle perfects in this function, e.g. *ruroca* and *ruruce* beside *rocate* "to shine", a situation which seems to have led to the secondary factitive function of the active perfect.

The cases of suppletion[2] are not, with Whitney,[3] to be regarded as "accidental results of the vagaries of linguistic usage". They should be viewed in the light of the theories of aspect and related phenomena.

Some additional remarks may be subjoined on the category of tense.[4] Formally characterized by the type of stem, the type of ending and, in the course of time, by the presence or absence of the augment occurring in different combinations it is in the pure and systematized form including also a full-fledged future as known from classical Sanskrit or Latin a comparatively recent phenomenon.[5] In the oldest texts this category had not yet become fully grammaticized; the augment was facultative and tense oppositions were often neutralized.[6] Since the preterit with the non-obligate augment (which also in my opinion may be regarded as an originally independent element referring to the past)[7] has developed from the injunctive,[8] the only tempus in the proper sense of the term originally was the present.[9] The indicative present, besides expressing an actuality (a process happening simultaneously or nearly simultaneously with the context in which it is used), may have also a general ('timeless') sense, referring to the past or a near future.[10]

Contrary to an oft repeated opinion[11] there are no sound arguments to prove the existence of an old Indo-European future.[12] The futurum in *-sy-*, being an indicative, serves to refer to a process in the future time as a

---

[1] Renou, o.c., p. 139 ff.

[2] Delbrück, Altindische Syntax, p. 273 f.

[3] Whitney, in A.J.P. 13, p. 288.

[4] See also Renou, La théorie des temps du verbe d'après les grammairiens sanskrits, J.A. 248 (1960), p. 305 ff.

[5] See e.g. Elizarenkova, Development; Gonda, Moods, p. 22 ff.

[6] K. Strunk, in I.F. 73, p. 309 is no doubt right in emphasizing the part played in this process by the opposition of the personal endings.

[7] Less probably "indicating 'perfectivation'" (Hirt, IdG. Grammatik, IV, p. 171; V. Lesný, in Arch. Or. 7, p. 197 ff. basing himself on a Slavonic phenomenon) or "expressing the idea of 'there, then'" (Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 303).

[8] See ch. IV, p. 103 ff.

[9] Cf. also E. Risch, in Gnomon, 33 (1961), p. 176.

[10] Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 365.

[11] Cf. e.g. Hirt, IdG. Grammatik, IV, p. 177.

[12] Kuiper, in A.O., 12, p. 286 ff. and see Gonda, Moods, passim.

foreseen or prospective fact (which may, it is true, be desired).[1] It is very rare in the retrospective and mythological hymns. The likewise oft repeated view[2] that it continues expressing modal nuances formerly conveyed by other categories, is incorrect.[3] There is in the Veda a strong tendency to limit its use to direct speech and to replace it elsewhere by the future participle with *bhavati, syāt, āsa*, a periphrasis enabling the author to introduce the modal or temporal implications of these auxiliaries. Occurring also freely in negative sentences it was from the beginning ousting the subjunctive from interrogations, but was in the oldest texts rare in subordinate clauses.

An augmented form of the future stem with secondary endings (the so-called conditional)[4] may in indirect speech have the force of a future thrown into the past (ŚB. 11, 5, 1, 4 *cirám tán mene yád vásah paryádhāsyata* "he deemed it too long if he should put on his garment"). The disappearance of this use and the spread of the well-known *iti* constructions exhibiting the form of direct speech prevented the development of a regular system of indirect speech in Sanskrit.[5]

The imperative in *-tāt*[6] expresses, in remarkable agreement with its Latin counterpart[7] in *-tō(d)*, a temporal rather than a logical consecution. Cf. ŚB. 3, 2, 1, 22 "Say to her 'come'*(brūhi)*, and when she has come, say *(brūtāt)* it us", and TS. 1, 3, 6 where it occurs after a future. The hypothesis that the second element was in origin the ablative of the demonstrative *to-* (cf. *tāt/d* "thus, in that way") has very much to recommend it.

As to the Aktionsarten, i.e. distinction of objective and intrinsic peculiarities or modifications of the process with special regard to its progress or completion in the lexical sphere,[8] it may suffice to recall the influence exerted by preverbs on the meaning of a verbal compound.[9] Thus the 'basic meaning' of *sam* realizes itself in two ways; it may express "a being or bringing together" or "forming a completeness", the respective translations being "(together) with" and "thoroughly" or "completely".[10]

---

[1] I cannot subscribe to Renou's explication of the difference between the future and the subjunctive (Décadence, p. 30). The "natural relationship" of both categories was exaggerated by Whitney, in A.J.P. 13, p. 288.

[2] Cf. e.g. Speyer, Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax, p. 59 f.

[3] See also Renou, in B.S.L. 56, p. 6 ff.

[4] See Speyer, Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax, p. 60.

[5] A. B. Keith, in J.A.O.S. 1910, p. 156 ff.

[6] Delbrück, Syntaktische Forschungen, III, Halle 1878, p. 2 ff. (who incorrectly speaks of a "modale Bedeutung"); the same, Altindische Syntax, p. 363.

[7] J. Wackernagel, Vorlesungen über Syntax, I², Basel 1926, p. 217 ff.

[8] Gonda, Aspects, p. 24 and see p. 225 ff.

[9] Cf. J. Wackernagel, in G.G.N. 1902, p. 747 ff. (= Kleine Schriften, p. 137 ff.); K. von Garnier-Moewes, Die Präposition als sinnverstärkendes Präfix, Thesis Heidelberg 1906.

[10] For a somewhat different explanation: K. von Garnier-Moewes, o.c. and in I.F. 25, p.

In the Veda, the syntax of the causatives is gradually developing, a 'double causative', or rather a causative of a transitive verb, being absent in the ancient texts, with the exception of those verbs which express a sensation.[1]

The functions of the so-called genera verbi (voices, diatheses), especially that of the medial voice *(ātmanepadam)*, have, among Indo-Europeanists, been a much disputed topic.[2] The old-fashioned enumerations of the functions of the middle—direct and indirect medium, dynamic reflexive and reciprocal medium etc.[3]—created the impression of an incoherent mixture of functions and various attempts to give a general definition— "das ganze Subjekt ist beteiligt";[4] "le sujet est intéressé d'une manière personelle au procès";[5] "le procès doit être envisagé par rapport au sujet";[6] "l'action concerne le sujet plus directement que tout autre personne"[7]— were vague and inadequate. Deducing too weighty conclusions from non-existing forms, unnecessarily assuming functional transitions and over-looking the fact that some active presents appear later than the cor-responding middle forms, Kuryłowicz[8] unconvincingly regarded the idea of "for oneself" ("pour soi") as the essential characteristic of the *ātmane-padam: pávate*, which should have meant "faire briller pour soi", owes, he suggests, its meaning "il brille; becomes bright" to the supposed dis-appearance of *pávati* "il fait briller". Some general hypotheses with regard to a secondary development of the typical function of the middle[9] need not detain us. Suggesting that originally the division active: middle was a question of root rather than endings and basing therefore his inquiries on the activa and media tantum Delbrück[10] supposed the opposition of the genera to have become more distinct in the course of time. However, there is no clear tendency to accentuate the differences between both categories; on the contrary, many distinctions observed in the earlier

86 ff. (see p. 100; not wholly convincing).

[1] Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 372 f.; Thieme, Plusquamperfektum, p. 27 ff.; Kuryłowicz, in R.O. 6, p. 205 f.; 8, p. 94 ff.

[2] Delbrück, Altindische Syntax, p. 236 intentionally abandons any attempt at defining activum and medium.

[3] Speyer, Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax, p. 48 f.

[4] Brugmann, K.V.G. p. 598; Grundriss ²II, 3, p. 685. A. J. Eaton, The Ātmanepada in Rigveda, Thesis Leipzig 1884 even distinguished a middle as (direct, indirect etc.) reflexive, as passive, as active.

[5] Meillet, Introduction, p. 244.

[6] Renou, Grammaire sanscrite, p. 392.

[7] Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 362.

[8] Kuryłowicz, Le genre verbal en indo-iranien, R.O. 1929, p. 199 ff.

[9] Brugmann, in I.F. 39, p. 131 ff.; Meillet, in B.S.L. 23, p. 64 ff. Cf. also Debrunner, in Glotta, 25, p. 78.

[10] Delbrück, Vergleichende Syntax, II, p. 415.

Vedic period were neglected in the brāhmaṇas[1] to be obliterated in classical Sanskrit.[2] Combining Delbrück's principle with a search for a unitary function (general definition) Benveniste[3] considered the active to indicate "un procès qui s'accomplit à partir du sujet et hors de lui", the middle "un procès dont le sujet est le siège; le sujet est intérieur au procès".[4] After him the thesis was defended[5] that the essential function of the inherited medial voice was to denote that a process is taking place with regard to, or is affecting, happening to, a person or a thing; this definition includes also those cases in which something powerful was believed to be at work in or through the subject and those in which the process was limited to the 'sphere' of the subject. With this general function the construction of many medial verbs is in harmony:[6] *tair bhuñjate*, though translated "they enjoy (eat) them", really means "they profit by them"; on the other hand, *garbhaṃ dhatte* "she conceives" may be explained as "she experiences the process of placing with regard to a child".[7]

The functions of the verbal adjectives in *-tá-* and *-ná-*, which originally were indifferent to tempus and diathesis[8]—for instance, their function as the nominal counterpart of definite categories of verbs (passives, intransitives)—were from time to time elucidated more exactly,[9] one of the matters in dispute being the delimitation of the active and passive uses[10] and the question as to whether an active use was the continuation of an inherited state of affairs or an innovation, due to analogy or particular circumstances.[11]

In the Ṛgveda, nominal sentences[12]—also an element of solemn style[13]—though common, are comparatively rare and uncomplicated and do not

---

[1] B. Liebich, Pāṇini, Leipzig 1891, p. 35 ff.

[2] See e.g. Speyer, Sanskrit Syntax, p. 237.

[3] E. Benveniste, Actif et moyen, in Grammaire et psychologie, numéro spécial du Journal de psychologie, Paris 1950, p. 119 ff.

[4] Cf. also D. Andersen, Om Brugen og Betydningen af Verbets genera i Sanskrit, Thesis Copenhagen 1892, p. 44; 107 etc.

[5] J. Gonda, in Lingua, 9 (1960), p. 30 ff.; 175 ff.

[6] For relations between the middle voice and the meaning of the root see also I.J.S. Taraporewala, in Jha Commemoration Volume, Poona 1937, p. 411.

[7] For the passive see ch. IV, p. 90 f; for a survey of the opinions regarding the agens in passive sentences: K. H. Schmidt, in I.F. 68, p. 1 ff.

[8] Their use is sufficiently described by Speyer, Sanskrit Syntax, p. 281 ff.

[9] Gonda, Remarks on the Sanskrit passive, Leiden 1951, p. 104 ff.; the same, in Lingua, 9, p. 68 ff.

[10] (Wackernagel-) Debrunner, Altindische Grammatik, II, p. 576 ff.

[11] H. Bechert, in M.S.S. 10, p. 54 ff.

[12] Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 356 f.; J. Bloch, La phrase nominale en sanskrite, in M.S.L. 14, p. 27 ff. (also published separately, Paris 1906); Meillet, in M.S.L. 14, p. 1 ff.; H. Jacobi, in I.F. 14, p. 236 ff. (= Kleine Schriften, Wiesbaden 1970, p. 6 ff.); for nominal sentences where later usage would prefer a compound: W. Wüst, in Z.D.M.G. 80, p. 171.

[13] J. Benigny, in I.F. 47, p. 124 ff.

normally refer to past events or non-actuality.[1] In the Ṛgveda most of
them follow or precede verbal or semi-nominal sentences with the same
subject. One of the earliest representatives of the nominal style is the
dative of abstract nouns, mostly those in *-ti-* or *-ana-* which have a final
function and are translatable by a subordinate clause.[2] Special mention
may be made of the appositional constructions of the type *dvādaśa māsāḥ
saṃvatsaraḥ* "the year consists of twelve months"[3] and of the prose for-
mulas of the type *tad aśvasyāśvatvam* "that is why a horse is called horse",
which attest the beginning of the predilection for nominal sentence con-
struction. Though co-existing with equivalent verbal constructions this
mode of expression no doubt belonged to the technical speech forms of
the learned. The most common type is the combination of two nouns ex-
pressing an assertion, identification, definition etc. Often and increasingly
one of the nouns is a verbal adjective in *-tá-*[4] or a gerundive which gain in
flexibility.[5] These inherited types remain the most frequent.[6] However,
the strongly marked predilection for passive sentence constructions, so
characteristic for Sanskrit, is foreign to the older period.[7]

The verba impersonalia[8] are certainly not as has been supposed[9] re-
interpreted verbal substantives in *-ti-*. They are not in frequent use, in
contradistinction to the impersonal passive of later times, attested to
by Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā 1, 8, 7 *paśúvratena bhavitavyam* "one must behave
like cattle".[10]

The most characteristic form of the Sanskrit verbal system, the absolu-
tive,[11] has in the oldest texts not yet fully developed. Having, in all prob-
ability, arisen from the instrumental (ṚV. 1, 110, 4) it originally was a

---

[1] The expression of non-actuality etc. requires the copula.

[2] Oertel, in SitzungsBer. München 1941, II, 9.

[3] Oertel, in B.S.O.S. 8, p. 685 ff.

[4] For 'participles as finite verbs', aposiopese etc. Keith, in Z.D.M.G. 63, p. 346 ff. For
the use of participles in general: Renou, Études de grammaire sanskrite, Paris 1936, p. 1
ff.

[5] Renou, Valeur du parfait, p. 100; 193.

[6] For some other types occurring in Vedic prose and after see Delbrück, Altindische
Syntax, p. 15; compare also Brugmann, Die Syntax des einfachen Satzes im indogerma-
nischen, Berlin-Leipzig 1925.

[7] For a critical discussion of an attempt at explaining the use of the passive from an
'Allkraftbegriff' (H. Hartmann, Das Passiv, Heidelberg 1954), see Gonda, in Lingua, 5, p.
428 ff.

[8] Delbrück, Altindische Syntax, p. 3 ff.; W. Havers, Primitive Weltanschauung und
Impersonalia, Wörter und Sachen, 11 (1928), p. 75 ff.; W. Brandenstein, in I.F. 46 (1928),
p. 1 ff.

[9] Th. Siebs, in K.Z. 43, p. 253 ff.

[10] O. Böhtlingk, in Z.D.M.G. 42, p. 366 ff.

[11] P. D. Gune, Die altindischen Absolutiva, Thesis Leipzig 1913; Keith, in J.R.A.S. 1907,
p. 164 ff.; Renou, in B.S.L. 41 (1940), p. 208 ff.; Gonda, in Kavirāj Abhinandana Grantha,
Lucknow 1967, p. 262 ff.

"déterminant de manière", closely connecting two processes (2, 12, 3):
"détermination adventice du verbe principal". It may for instance convey
a causal implication (ŚB. 5, 4, 6, 11 "dadurch dass er ... hatte"). Though
temporal it is much less markedly indicative of an anterior process than
in later times (1, 161, 12; 162, 18). It has a preference for short sentences
and does not, as a rule, 'govern' more than one word (object). In longer
sentences the poets, whilst avoiding it, use participial constructions or
subordinative conjunctions. In the ancient narrative style—abounding in
participles, temporal clauses and successions of independent sentences—
it does not normally occur, but the authors of sūtras and ritual chapters
of the brāhmaṇas readily resort to it exactly to indicate the chronological
succession of the ritual acts etc. This use is continued in post-Vedic Sans-
krit;[1] increasing—in contradistinction to finite verbal forms—in fre-
quency it is the main device for forming complex sentences.

   Whereas the five instances of the so-called infinitive (rather supine) in
-tum[2] occurring in the oldest corpus do not foreshadow the future monop-
oly of this formation, it becomes more common in the brāhmaṇas. In
the Śatapatha it numerically surpasses the other case forms of a nominal
-tu- stem -toḥ and -tavai without however being a syntactically flexible
and freely used category. In the sūtra style it is rare; here future partici-
ples or compounds in -arthe "for (the sake of)" are sometimes preferred.[3]

   As is well known, there is no accusativus cum infinitivo;[4] the accusative
with a participle[5] which occurs already in the oldest texts (ṚV. 1, 105, 18
aruṇó mā ... vŕkaḥ ... yántaṃ dadarśa "a tawny wolf saw me go"), should
not[6] be considered a type of indirect speech or an equivalent of a subordi-
nate clause.

   Sanskrit has a marked predilection for the direct construction,[7] even
after yathā or yad, the oratio obliqua being almost entirely limited to
relative clauses depending on verbs of "knowing, learning, asking"
(pṛcchámi yátra ... "I ask where ... "); the Veda exhibits also the sentence

---

[1] Whitney, Sanskrit grammar, p. 358 incorrectly says that this category did not change
its character.
[2] Renou, Le suffixe -tu- et la constitution des infinitifs, Monographies sanskrites, Paris
1937. For the forms in -am see Renou, in M.S.L. 23, p. 359 ff. Cf. also ch. III, p. 67.
[3] G. M. Panse, in Vishv. Ind. J. 1, p. 290.
[4] For an unsuccessful discussion: F. Wolff, in K.Z. 39, p. 490 ff.
[5] A. Debrunner, in A.O. 20, p. 121 f.
[6] With Speyer, Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax, p. 92. Cf. H. Oertel, in SitzungsBer.
München, 1941, II, 9 passim.
[7] Speyer, Sanskrit syntax, p. 379 ff.; Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax, p. 92; 63; Renou,
Grammaire védique, p. 392 f.; Debrunner, in A.O. 20, p. 120 ff.; stray remarks also in con-
nection with the order of words: E. Kieckers, in I.F. 35 (1915), p. 1 ff. As to iti see Keith, in
J.R.A.S. 1910, p. 1317 ff.

type TB. 3, 11, 8, 7 *sá vaí tám avá návindad yásmai ... áneṣyat* "non invenit ... cui mitteret". Instances of this 'Modusverschiebung'[1] are, like those of 'Personenverschiebung', rare. There are some cases of direct speech introduced by *yathā*,[2] hardly any of indirect subordinate interrogations introduced by an interrogativum. In the hymns the indirect construction is in the first stage of its development.

One of the many subjects which, though dealt with by Delbrück and Speyer, have gained much by a reconsideration based upon a large collection of facts, is subordination.[3] Even smaller word groups often are, contrary to our usage, of a co-ordinate structure (juxtaposition: ṚV. 5, 59, 7 *váyo ... śréṇīḥ*, and not "swarms of birds").[4] The rigid and severe style of the Vedic prose works, which makes hardly any use of complex sentences, not to mention periods,[5] takes, on the other hand, full advantage of bipartite compound sentence constructions, formed by means of *ya-* and some of its derivatives, *yāvat* and a few other conjunctions. Although these constructions with *yathā, yadā, yadi, yāvat* etc. are generally speaking rather uniform in structure, there is much diversity of detail. Thus *yathā* is much more often than the other conjunctions a complement of a verb; *yadi* forms a pair with *api, yatra* and *yadā* may assume *eva* to express a variety of minute and precise nuances. That the case of *ced* "if, when" is a special one, finds its explanation in its origin: being *ca + id* (AV. 2, 30, 2 *sáṃ cén náyātho ... sáṃ ca vákṣathaḥ* "that you both lead together and bring together") it adopted one of the syntactic functions of *ca* (ṚV. 1, 40, 6 *imáṃ ca ... vácam pratiháryathā ... aśnavat* "if you willingly accept this word, it will acquire ...").[6] More accurately, the particle *ca*,[7] far from being equivalent to the English *and*, essentially underlines, like its relatives in the cognate languages, complementary connection; in translating the contexts in which it occurs we make their implied additive, adversative, conditional etc. meanings explicit by adding our "and", "but", "if" etc.

---

[1] Delbrück, Vergl. Syntax, III, p. 439 ff.

[2] Debrunner, o.c., p. 127 ff.; A. B. Keith, in J.R.A.S. 1910, p. 1317 ff.

[3] A. Minard, La subordination dans la prose védique, Paris 1936, systematically studying the subordinating conjunctions, the place and function of their correlatives, the moods and tenses used. Some observations on the position of the correlatives, the relations between the subordinate and principal clauses etc. were already made by H. Jacobi, in Verhandlungen 43. Versammlung deutscher Philologen, Strassburg 1896.

[4] Th. Aufrecht, in K.Z. 38, p. 501 f.

[5] It would be of special syntactic interest exactly to point out how the increasing use of bahuvrīhi compounds made an extensive development of subordinate clauses superfluous. Cf. Whitney, in A.J.P. 13, p. 281.

[6] Cf. also E. Schwyzer, in I.F. 23, p. 163 ff.; Wackernagel, Kleine Schriften, p. 258 f.

[7] J. Gonda, The use of the particle *ca*, Vāk, 5, p. 1 ff.; cf. the same, in Mnemosyne, IV, 7 (Leyden 1954), p. 177 ff.; 265 ff,

The stem *ya-*[1] is traditionally described as a relative pronoun,[2] the clauses in which it occurs as relative clauses. It is Porzig's[3] merit to have shown that these definitions need correction and that a thorough analytical study of all relevant texts not only makes us acquainted with a considerable variety of *ya-* clauses and their constructions, but also opens up opportunities to obtain an insight into their historical evolution. Justly criticizing Delbrück's "Einteilung nach der Bezugsmasse des Relativums", because "(diese) bereits eine inhaltliche Erfassung nicht nur der Gesamt-vorstellung, sondern auch ihrer Gliederung voraussetzt, ... die eine rein formale Einteilung erst erschlieszen will", he demonstrated the frequent occurrence of an adjectival *ya-* in syntactic units without a finite verb (ṚV. 5, 13, 3 *agnír* ... | *hótā yó mánuṣeṣu á*, not, with Geldner, "der der Opferpriester unter den Menschen ist", but "the hotar among men"; 5, 3, 3 *yát te jánima cáru*, not "wenn deine schöne Geburt stattfindet", but "thy lovely offspring"; cf. also instances such as 4, 50, 9 *prátijanyāni utá yá sájanyā* "von Feind und Freund"; 7, 35, 14) which may function e.g. as a nominativus pendens (2, 41, 1 *vāyo yé te sahasríṇaḥ | ráthāsas tébhir á gahi*, not "Vāyu! Du hast ... Wagen, mit denen komm", but "Vāyu, thy thousandfold chariots—come with these") and with this element (6, 20, 1 *yá ... tasthāu rayíḥ ... | tám ... daddhi* "the wealth which has come—give that"; 7, 84, 4 *prá yá ādityó ánṛtā mināti*: Porzig[4] translates "der Āditya, der das Unrecht vernichtet", but a full translation of the whole line requires, if not the insertion of "while",[5] a special intonation).[6] In addition to this analysis he studied the relation between the *ya-* group and the complete sentence (period): the former can be 'nominativisch', 'akkusa-tivisch' etc., it can precede or follow the other component part of the sentence; if the latter contains an accented demonstrative pronoun "sub-ordination is not in doubt"; the *ya-* group can "function as a 'Satzglied'" (2, 27, 14 ff. *mṛla | yád vo vayáṃ cakṛmá ... ágaḥ* "verzeiht die Sünde, die wir gegen Euch begangen haben", preferable to Geldner's "... wenn wir ... begangen haben"; 3, 14, 7). In the next section Porzig discussed the

---

[1] Compare also the short observations made in chapter III, and p. 75, n. 4 and 5.

[2] Whitney, Sanskrit grammar, p. 195; Delbrück, Altindische Syntax, p. 553 ff.; Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 236.

[3] W. Porzig, Die Hypotaxe im Rigveda, I.F. 41 (1923), p. 210 ff. For a justified criticism of E. Hermann, Gab es im Indogermanischen Nebensätze?, K.Z. 33, p. 481 ff. see p. 292.

[4] Porzig, o.c., p. 223.

[5] Cf. Porzig, p. 237 on 3, 57, 3; p. 239, on 3, 47, 4 etc.: "(es) liegt weder formal noch in-haltlich der geringste Anlasz vor, den *ya-* Satz dem Nachsatz zu subordinieren". Cf. also p. 250 on 2, 14, 6.

[6] The various sub-types distinguished ("*ya-* Gruppe als Subjekt", "... als Objekt", e.g. 7, 70, 3, "... im Genitiv", e.g. 7, 29, 4) can be disregarded here.

'substantival' *ya*- which occurs in similar syntactic circumstances.[1]

This useful survey, rich in valuable—beside, it is true, unsatisfactory—interpretative observations, is followed by a hypothesis regarding the (prehistoric) development of these *ya*- groups, which, claiming to have fixed in detail and in a chronological scheme the course of analogy and the interrelations of the main sub-types, is too speculative and complicated to carry conviction.[2] The author is no doubt right in rejecting the thesis of the originality of the relative function of I.E. *$\mathring{i}o$-[3]—"der artikelhafte Gebrauch" of *ya*- is also in my opinion inherited—but in hazardously undertaking to read the history of the *ya*- group, which in his opinion developed into relative clauses in India and independently of the related languages, from the Ṛgvedic texts he relies too much on statistical data, overlooking that these may not only depend on the possibilities of chronological difference, but also on such factors as the origin of the poets or the idiomatic peculiarities of their milieus.[4] Besides, Porzig's opinion with regard to the supposedly original position of the accented verb at the head of the 'subordinate clause' and, hence, his conclusion that the *ya*-groups at the outset always preceded the principal clause, cannot be based upon irrefutable facts. It seems therefore safer to characterize I.E. *$\mathring{i}o$*- as an 'includer'[5] forming word groups of a comparatively high degree of independence, and focussing attention on them; helping to express predominating ideas in a more or less isolated emphatical way; distinguishing one element of the sentence from the others:[6] AiB. 7, 27, 4 *yas tvaṃ kathaṃ vettha* "how do yoú know?"; ṚV. 10, 80, 6 *agníṃ víśa īḷate mánuṣīr yā́ḥ* "Agni is worshipped by the húman communities"; 1, 91, 9 *sóma yā́s te mayobhúva ūtáyaḥ sánti* ... | *tā́bhir* ... "Soma, the delightful forms of assistance thou hast ..., with these ..." —often in explanations or definitions (AiB. 4, 13, 6 *yad vai rathaṃtaraṃ tad vairūpam*, not "what the *r.* is that is the *v.*", but "the *v.* (emphasized) is the *r.*"); to indicate the theme of the utterance (ṚV. 3, 46, 5); to ascribe a new qualification to a word which is already qualified otherwise (2, 32, 6). It is, further, interesting to observe that these functions—which should not induce us to speak of a

---

[1] I would avoid saying that in the third case the *ya*-group is "innerhalb einer Periode zur Funktion eines Satzgliedes herabgedrückt" (p. 259).

[2] The author is of course right in emphasizing (p. 286) that "(eine) Darlegung auf dem Boden psychologischer Veranschaulichung" runs the risk of aiming at "das Mögliche oder Denkbare", not at "das Wirkliche und Gewesene".

[3] Explicitly or implicitly defended by Delbrück, Grundriss, V, p. 295 ff.; Brugmann, K.V.G., p. 659; Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, I, 2, p. 433.

[4] Chronological inferences, deduced from the study of one single, or a few, syntactic criteria are, in general, unreliable.

[5] As described in chapter III (p. 75). See Gonda, in Lingua, 4, p. 1 ff.

[6] Cf. Speyer, Sanskrit syntax, p. 353.

'definite article'—are in harmony with those of the conjunction *yad* which originates in a nominative-accusative neuter of *ya-* (AiB. 1, 6, 1 *pañcavīryaṃ vā etac chando yad virāṭ* "the *v.* is a metre of five strengths". One may, indeed, consider the regular relative function to have developed especially in those sentences which contained an anaphoric-demonstrative (resumptive) pronoun or another term functioning as a correlative, but should abstain from detailed chronological hypotheses,[1] because the hieratic language of our texts, retaining fixed phrases, does not allow us to form a true and complete picture of the linguistic conditions in general and to make certain of the non-existence of definite uses in a given period.

Special mention may be made of the frequent sentence type *yasmai puruṣāya bhikṣāṃ adadām sa mayā dṛṣṭaḥ* "I have seen the man to whom I (formerly) gave alms."[2] Here, too, *ya-* —while resumed by *sa*—brings a word or group of words into prominence, the noun *puruṣa-* being essentially determined by the attributive clause of which it forms part. If however the *ya-* group "bloss dazu dient, die Bezugsmasse näher zu präcisieren, ... zu beschreiben ohne jedoch unentbehrlich zum rechten Verständniss des im Hauptsatz gesagten zu sein",[3] that is, if it characterizes only incidentally, the 'antecedent' is included in the principal clause and another order of words may be chosen: *mayā puruṣo dṛṣṭo yasmai bhikṣām adadām*.[4] Since this difference in construction recurs in Greek it can hardly be supposed to have arisen in Vedic India. An examination of the complications usually known as 'Verschränkung' likewise shows that this pronoun, in Sanskrit as well as in other ancient I.E. languages, contained almost unlimited possibilities to express various nuances, or to call attention to some element of the utterance by spreading the words over the two clauses of a period (cf. e.g. ṚV. 5, 18, 1; 6, 5, 2; 6, 33, 1; 7, 60, 8; 7, 67, 8). Although the term 'attractio inversa'[5] is not used by authors on Sanskrit syntax, the phenomenon itself is also Indian (ṚV. 10, 85, 3 *sómaṃ* (and not *sómo*) *yám brahmā́ṇo vidúr | ná tásyāśnāti káś caná* "the soma which the brahmans know—of that nobody eats"). Nor is the so-called 'pregnant

---

[1] Phrases of the type ṚV. 1, 18, 1 *kakṣī́vantaṃ yá auśijáḥ* "K. (viz.) the Au. (son of Uśij)" are not, with Delbrück, Grundriss, V, p. 307 ff. and others (see Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, p. 556) to be regarded as having been in the beginning "Perioden mit Haupt- und Nebensatz". The lines of thought developed by E. Hermann in too abstract and speculative an argument (Das Pronomen **i̯os* als Adjektivum, Koburg 1897, p. 24 f.) start from the assumption of the alternative: full-fledged relative pronouns or anaphoric demonstrative pronoun—in favour of which the author decides—which now may be considered antiquated.

[2] See W. Caland, Zur Syntax der Pronomina im Avesta, Amsterdam Acad. 1891, p. 29.

[3] Caland, o.c., p. 37.

[4] For details see Lingua, 4, p. 22 ff.

[5] Lingua, 4, p. 32 f.

use'[1] rare, the English translation being as a rule "if a ... ", sometimes also "when a ... " or "while ..." etc.: ṚV. 2, 28, 10 *yó ... me ... sákhā ... áha | tásmād ... pāhy asmā́n* "if (when) a comrade speaks ..., protect us from that" (cf. also 1, 7, 7; 6, 6, 4; 7, 84, 4). This construction should not be described[2] as an anacolouthon; it finds its explanation in a widespread predilection of popular parlance for expressing conditional (and other) relations 'implicitly' without devices such as conjunctions (cf. MS. 2, 5, 1 *sóma evā́smai réto dádhāti pūṣā́ paśū́n prá janayati* "if (when, while, as) Soma gives him seed, Pūṣan produces animals"). Here it is the intonation which indicates that the two successive clauses are intimately connected and the verb of the first clause is in accordance with the well-known general rule[3] accented, showing the incompleteness[4] of this clause.[5] From the quotation it appears that these pairs of clauses are not always 'antithetical' in a wide sense of this term (ṚV. 2, 30, 9; 2, 34, 9). It may be noticed that the stereotyped neuter *yad*, alternating with *yadi*, even developed into a regular explicit means of expressing the conditional relation (1, 1, 6; cf. 6, 34, 3). The function of *ya-* to express (almost always in clauses which follow the principle clause) a cause, consequence, disposition, or incidentally also a purpose[6] and the corresponding causal, final and consecutive functions of *yad*[7] admit of a similar explanation (ŚB. 4, 1, 5, 7 *yán nā́vediṣaṃ ténāhiṃsiṣam* "because I did not know you, I have offended you").

As to the so-called prepositions Gaedicke[8] was perfectly right in observing that the dictionaries greatly exaggerate the prepositional significance of this class of words which often rather function as adverb or preverb. In the Ṛgveda the prepositions proper are of a remarkable rarity.[9] Nor is their adverbial use frequent. Originally added for the sake of clarity, explication, or delicate differentiation preverbs were in many cases absent where in later times, when the number of compound verbs had enormously increased, the expression of a modification of the verb's meaning required

---

[1] J. Vendryes, in B.S.L. 128 (1948), p. 21 ff.; Oertel, Syntax of cases, I, p. 55 ff.; my remarks in Lingua, 4, p. 33 ff.

[2] With Speyer, Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax, p. 85 and Oertel, o.c.

[3] Delbrück, Altind. Syntax, p. 37 ff.; Macdonell, Vedic grammar, p. 106; Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 383 (cf. p. 74). See also Meillet, in B.S.L. 34, p. 122 ff. and ch. II, p. 38.

[4] I prefer this term to "subordination".

[5] This is not to subscribe to the forced explanation suggested by Delbrück, Altindische Syntax, p. 35 ff., according to which the partial non-timelessness, originally a result of the fact that the clause in which the verb occurs precedes another clause, became generalized into a means of distinction of all dependent clauses which involve a suspension of sense or an incomplete sense as compared with the main clause to which they belong.

[6] See e.g. Speyer, Sanskrit syntax, p. 354 ff.

[7] See e.g. Speyer, Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax, p. 87 f.

[8] Gaedicke, o.c., p. 193 f.

[9] Renou, E.V.P. II, p. 113 ff.

a compound.[1] For instance, *jānāti* "to know, perceive" could in ancient texts bear the force of *anu-jānāti* or *prati-jānāti* "to approve". Two preverbs accompanying the same verb are however no rare occurrence.[2] In the brāhmaṇas, preverbs[3] are no longer used postpositively; so-called tmesis has become very rare, especially in subordinate phrases and non-finite forms.[4] The gradual process of fixation may, to a certain extent and in addition to other criteria, be utilized to ascertain the relative chronology of the texts.[5]

Attention was drawn to the fact that the negative sentence is not in all respects the counterpart of the affirmative sentence.[6] Because of the laudative contents of that work and of the possibilities proffered by the privative prefix[7] it is comparatively rare in the Ṛgveda.[8] In the beginning of a sentence *ná* is incompatible with "particules d'attaque" such as *atha;* it does not combine with an imperative and is, to express a prevention, supplied by *mā́* and the injunctive (mostly of the aorist);[9] it is rare in sentences containing an optative and in subordinate clauses.

Particles play a very important part in the Veda. Often hardly translatable they indicate a large variety of nuances, lay special emphasis upon some element of the sentence, underline connections or mark some form of continuation. In a text such as the Śatapathabrāhmaṇa, in which "le style s'exprime en termes de syntaxe",[10] these emphatic and connective elements are therefore most essential and an absolutely integral part of the syntactic structure. Asyndeton being very common, the presence of a particle impresses us as testifying to a special intention on the author's part.[11] Yet, a satisfactory definition of the concept 'particle' has not yet been given, mainly because, as already intimated, indeclinable words are not very distinctly divided into separate parts of speech.[12]

Nor have all attempts at reaching a complete understanding of the functions of individual particles been successful. Many authors limited themselves to mere arrangements of the 'meanings' or 'uses' of a particle[13]

---

[1] Gonda, in A.O. 20, p. 167 ff.
[2] Renou, o.c., p. 125 ff.
[3] Oldenberg, in Z.D.M.G. 61, p. 803 ff. discusses their position, accentuation, accumulation.
[4] A. Cuny, Les préverbes dans le Çatapathabrāhmaṇa, M.S.L. 14, p. 289 ff.
[5] Renou, in B.S.L. 34, p. 49 ff.
[6] Renou, in B.S.L. 43, p. 43 ff.
[7] See chapter III, p. 70.
[8] Oldenberg, Noten, II, p. 175; E. Channing, in P.A.O.S. 1886, p. XVIII.
[9] Gonda, Moods, p. 36; 201 ff.
[10] Renou, in B.S.L. 52, II, p. 33.
[11] Cf. also Renou, E.V.P. I, p. 65.
[12] Cf. W. D. Whitney, Sanskrit grammar, p. 403.
[13] Cf. e.g. Speyer, Sanskrit syntax, p. 331 f. Thus C. G. Hartman, Emphasizing and con-

while leaving their readers in the dark as to the interrelations of their uses and to its central or nuclear function, i.e. to that which is common to all its contextual uses. However, a closer examination may throw light upon these interrelations and show that a fundamental functional unity is not absent. For instance, most uses of the particle *api*[1] may be satisfactorily explained from a vague and general idea of "by, near, add to this".[2] This is not to say that we would be equally successful in tracing the historical development of the use of these particles in detail.[3]

It has often been taken for granted that in versified texts metrical considerations[4] interfere to such an extent with the 'ordinary position' of words—"one of the most captivating and at the same time elusive problems of grammar"[5]—that they do not give us a reliable idea of a normal order of words:[6] syntactically connected elements are separated and what does not belong together logically is placed in close connection for reasons of versification or "considérations affectives, harmoniques, le cas échéant rituelles".[7] Yet an investigation into the composition and syntactic structure of the metrical texts and an evaluation of its results in the light of comparative linguistics lead us to revise our opinions. From a study of the Ṛgvedic and Atharvaṇic *anuṣṭubh* stanzas[8] in which attention was focussed, inter alia, on the relation between the syntactic structure of the sentences and the metrical structure of the stanzas it emerged, first, that metrical units tend to be at the same time syntactic units, the smallest metrical unit (the *pāda*) often, and unlike classical usage, constituting a complete syntactic unit and cases of 'internal enjambement' being comparatively rare, and, in the second place, that various versificatory devices limit the possibility of a syntactic chaos. There is, moreover, a marked tendency to bipartite or quadripartite structures which often goes so

necting particles in the thirteen principal upanishads, Helsinki Acad. 1966, p. 25 distinguishes a prothetic, an epithetic and a concessive *api*, and in addition to these, some special cases.

[1] Which is dealt with by Renou, Grammaire sanscrite under no less than five separate headings (p. 153; 378; 412; 511; 516).

[2] J. Gonda, in Lingua 21, p. 183 ff.; cf. also 20, p. 98 ff. For *ca* see above, p. 137, n. 7.

[3] Attention was drawn to *su* and *tu* by G. Liebert, in Studia linguistica 6 (Lund 1951), p. 53 ff.—For indeclinables in general: I. Dyen, The Sanskrit indeclinables of the Hindu grammarians and lexicographers, Language Dissertations 31, Baltimore 1939.

[4] In studying the relations between metre and syntax some scholars, among them E.V. Arnold, Vedic metre, Cambridge 1905, have unduly exaggerated the strictness and rigidity of the former and the influence it exerted upon the choice of words, word order etc. See also Renou, Introduction générale, p. 47.

[5] M. Bloomfield, in I.F. 31, p. 156.

[6] Macdonell, Vedic gr. f. stud., p. 283.

[7] Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 333.

[8] Gonda, The anuṣṭubh stanzas of the Ṛgveda, A.L.B. 31-32, p. 14 ff.; the same, Syntax and verse structure in the Veda, I.L. 1958 (Turner Jub. Vol.), p. 35 ff.

far as to result in stanzas consisting of two clauses or sentences of the same length. If a stanza consists of four or two sentences these are often characterized by vertical correspondence, e.g. anaphora, partial identity of word order, or other forms of repetition or parallelism. The marked trend towards a biarticulate structure of the stanza involves a tendency to a more or less balanced distribution of the syntagmas. A homogeneous, but at the same time biarticulate, whole often constitutes a compound or complex sentence. Another investigation into the syntactic structure of ancient metrical texts[1] brought to light that the syntactic dissimilarity between these texts and prose compositions has often been exaggerated, and that some authors[2] were too easily led to undue generalization with regard to a predilection for a "verschnörkeltes, durcheinandergewirbeltes Gefüge der Worte, ... ein launisches Verkürzen der Sätze". It can be shown that both genres have numerous syntactic structures in common which must have belonged to the ordinary speech habits of the Indian population in general and that deviations from these occur not only in poetry but also in prose. The former genre may even preserve definite sentence schemas which are lost in prose and in the spoken language. Especially when these structures are in substantial agreement with similar structures in the related languages and are explicable from natural tendencies some inferences with regard to their relation to the sentence structure of the living language,[3] however imperfectly known this may be, seem legitimate.

Of the sentence structures preferred by ancient Indian poets[4] and coinciding with metrical units the following[5] seems to have been usual in the spoken language. 1) Frequent, widespread and inherited is the predilection of a preverb for the first place in a sentence or verse quarter *(pāda)*, the verb to which it belongs being often separated from it by one or more other words[6] (AV. 2, 8, 2 *ápeyām (ápa iyám) rátry ucchatu* "let this night fade away"); (prose: TS. 2, 2, 1, 2 *ápa ... krāmati*). While the function of the adverbial element (a more or less graphic or emphatical indication of spatial or temporal relations etc.) is not foreign to its position, the verb is only in special cases placed at the beginning. For the poets this schema, like other types of distribution of syntactically associated elements over

---

[1] Gonda, Enkele opmerkingen over syntaxis en versbouw voornamelijk in het Vedisch, Amsterdam Acad. 1960; see also J. Zubatý, in W.Z.K.M. 2 (1888), p. 53 ff.; 310.
[2] W. Wüst, Der Schaltsatz im Ṛgveda, (unpublished) thesis München 1923, p. 225.
[3] Renou, in B.S.L. 61, p. 4 f.
[4] See also S. Bucca, Word order and its stylistic value in the Īśopaniṣad, Commemoration volume-P. K. Gode, Poona 1960, p. 34 ff.
[5] Besides other schemas which will be discussed further on or must be left unmentioned.
[6] Cf. Delbrück, Altind. Syntax, p. 45; Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 315; Grammaire sanscrite, p. 138.

two pādas, was a very welcome means of welding together two successive pādas so as to form a well-balanced half-stanza which from the syntactic point of view is a complete sentence. 2) Disjunction may help to avoid an unusual length of one of the constituent parts of a sentence or to throw one element of a word group into relief (ṚV. 1, 2, 7 *mitrám huve pūtádakṣam* "I invoke Mitra, of pure resourcefulness").[1] 3) A personal or demonstrative pronoun, followed by a vocative or the subject of the sentence begins the sentence, the verb ends it, the object is placed in the middle (AV. 1, 7, 7 *tvám agne yātudhā́nān | úpabaddhāṃ ihá vaha* "Do thou, O Agni, bring hither the sorcerers bound"). 4) The so-called 'rhythmical position' of the verb, or rather the middle position of the predicate.[2] 5) Duplication or even triplication (tricolon abundans) within the same unit (AV. 5, 4, 6 *tám ā́ vaha táṃ nís kuru | tám u me ágadaṃ kṛdhi* "bring him, relieve him, and make him free from disease for me"). 6) Duplication of an element of the sentence without any change in, or addition to, its normal schema is a normal procedure (ṚV. 1, 37, 6), when it occurs after a caesura it contributes to the unity of a half-stanza; even if this is filled up with vocatives etc. the result is not necessarily a doggerel of unnatural syntactic structure (ṚV. 1, 160, 5). Very often, moreover, two or more successive metrical units do not, it is true, constitute more than one sentence, but each of them is in that sentence a distinct word group, the beginning and end of which quite naturally coincide with the breaks in the verse. Very often the successive parts of the whole are loosely strung together without any noticeable attempt at artificiality (ṚV. 1, 1, 1), the order of the words being perfectly harmonious, appropriate and well-balanced and no doubt largely in harmony with the natural trends of the spoken language (ṚV. 1, 160, 3 *sá váhniḥ putráḥ pitróḥ pavítravān | punā́ti dhī́ro bhúvanāni māyáyā || dhenúṃ ca pṛ́śniṃ vṛṣabhám surétasam | viśvā́hā śukrám páyo asya dukṣata* "the charioteer son, who possesses the means of purification, of both parents, purifies, wise, the worlds, by his creative power; out of the spotted cow and the potent bull he always extracted their seed and milk").

In short, the sentence structure of the metrical texts, however 'free' in the ancient Indo-European sense of this term, is very often far from meaningless, largely functional and not infrequently in harmony with 'natural' tendencies. That is also one of the reasons why it is so often an aesthetic success. In most cases indeed the poets steered a middle course between the repetition of, or variation on, simple syntactic schemata on

---

[1] For this word group see also further on.
[2] See further on.

the one hand and more elaborate structures on the other; they preferred to express their thoughts in comparatively uncomplicated syntactic structures while supplementing or internally expanding these by epithets, vocatives and syntactic duplicates. This is however not to deny that the poetical tradition, the religious character and the liturgical function of these texts must have kept them markedly distinct from the spoken language. A comparatively frequent occurrence of definite schemata—for instance the 'Zwillingsformen'[1] of the type TS. 1, 1, 1 *iṣé tvā ūrjé tvā* "for prosperity thee, for invigoration thee" in AV. and YV.—was no doubt largely determined by the very purport of these magical and liturgical texts. On the other hand, traces of struggles to make normal syntactic schemata fit the metre are far from rare. Repetition, duplication and parallelism could help to fill up a verse. Many 'omissions' may be "simply due to lack of room for a word".[2] The saṃhitās abound in cases of ellipsis, brachylogy and other forms of brevity, a fact, like various other phenomena of 'linguistic condensation'[3] observed,[4] but all too often regarded as another piece of evidence of the poets' preference for uncommon locutions, a curious phraseology and an obscure style of speech. The relevant notes of Oldenberg[5] and Geldner[6] have no doubt tended to perpetuate inadequate views of what was after them studied as a collection of phenomena of economy in language and literary art.[7]

The order of the elements constituting a sentence,[8] though already attracting the attention of Delbrück,[9] was for many years studied no more than sporadically so that many questions have remained unanswered. From Wackernagel's famous publication[10] it became perfectly clear that the usual position of enclitics[11] is immediately after the opening of the

---

[1] W. Krause, in K.Z. 50, p. 74 ff.; p. 77 ff.

[2] M. Bloomfield, Rig-Veda repetitions, Cambridge Mass. 1916, p. 164.

[3] Renou, in B.S.L. 50, p. 47 ff.

[4] A. Bergaigne, in M.S.L. 4, p. 96; M. W. Easton, in P.A.O.S. 1873, p. LXIX; P. Regnaud, in Revue d'histoire des religions, 16, p. 166.

[5] Oldenberg, Noten.

[6] Geldner, translation.

[7] Renou, E.V.P. I, p. 29 ff.; Gonda, Ellipsis, brachylogy and other forms of brevity in speech in the Ṛgveda, Amsterdam Acad. 1960; the elliptical constructions in Vedic prose were studied by H. Oertel, Zu den altindischen Ellipsen, in K.Z. 67, p. 129 ff.; 68, p. 61 ff.

[8] Macdonell, Vedic gr. f. stud., p. 283 ff.; in prose: A. Minard, Trois énigmes sur les Cent Chemins, I, Paris 1949; II, Paris 1956, indices, s.v. (I, p. 220; II, p. 363).

[9] B. Delbrück, Die altindische Wortfolge aus dem Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa dargestellt, Syntaktische Forschungen, III, Halle 1878. See also J. Jolly, in Verhandlungen 29. Versammlung deutscher Philologen, 1874.

[10] J. Wackernagel, Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung, I.F. 1 (1892) p. 333 ff. (= Kleine Schriften, p. 1 ff.). Compare also Delbrück, Wortfolge, p. 47 and Altind. Syntax, p. 22; and Renou, Études de grammaire sanskrite, Paris 1936, p. 61 ff.

[11] For the enclitic pronouns see Caland in Z.D.M.G. 62, p. 128.

sentence; hence ṚV. 1, 51, 12 *ā́ smā rátham ... tiṣṭhasi;* ṚV. 1, 191, 6 *dyaúr vaḥ pitā́* "heaven is your father"; 8, 61, 10 *yádi me śṛṇávad dhávam* "if he hears my call"; *sá hovāca (ha uvāca) gā́rgyaḥ.* The same rule holds also in case of may 'mots accessoires'[1] (particles, pronouns etc.), which tend to occupy a rhythmically weak position. It provides an explanation of many occurrences of the so-called tmesis (even *dróghāya cid vácase* instead of **dróghavacase;*[2] *dyā́vā ha kṣā́mā* "heaven and earth"), and cannot be dissociated from the tendency of more or less subordinate or interjectional words (or word groups), e.g. (unaccented) vocatives, and the copula, to occur immediately after a word in a 'strong' position:[3] ṚV. 1, 8, 1 *éndra (= ā́ indra) bhara* "O Indra, bring hither", but 1, 8, 3 *índra ...* (where the accented vocative precedes the sentence); ṚV. 8, 90, 5 *tvám indra yaśā́ asi* "thou, Indra, art honoured"; AV. 12, 1, 54 *ahám asmi sáhamānaḥ* "I am overpowering". One of the corollaries of this rule is that a 'light' word following the verb often syntactically belongs to a word in the interior of the sentence: AV. 3, 23, 2 *ā́ te yónim gárbha etu* "let a foetus come to thy womb".[4] The natural counterpart of this tendency is the expectation, on the part of the hearer, that the preceding word is rhythmically strong or, as to its meaning or function in the context, may be comparatively important: hence the part played by the so-called emphatic particles.[5] It remains to be investigated to what extent the tendency to alternate rhythmically or functionally dissimilar words and to separate the immediate juxtaposition of 'strong' elements was systematized. Generally speaking, our knowledge of the part played by rhythm in the distribution of the elements of a sentence is still rather imperfect.

Stray remarks were made on the order of the elements of a word group, but these have not yet led to comprehensive surveys of all possibilities. In harmony with Wackernagel's rule the 'natural' position of accessory words is, in word groups consisting of three elements, in the middle (ṚV. 8, 25, 19 *agnír ná śukráḥ* "bright like Agni"; cf., in Latin, *hac de causa, magna cum laude*). Although, in metrical texts—and in the Ṛgveda more often than in the Atharvaveda and especially in principal clauses—a 'preverb' sometimes follows its verb (ṚV. 1, 8, 3 *jáyema sám yudhí* "may we completely conquer in the combat") it usually precedes it.[6] The position

---

[1] A. Meillet, La phrase nominale pure, M.S.L. 14, p. 1 ff., arguing that their being enclitic is not essential.

[2] Renou, in Language, 29, p. 235 f.

[3] Cf. Wackernagel, o.c., p. 425 (93).

[4] M. Bloomfield, in I.F. 31, p. 156.

[5] Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 375 "*íd* ... souligne le mot précédent ou la proposition dont cette particule suit le mot initial".

[6] See also A. Cuny, Les préverbes dans le Çatapathabrāhmaṇa, M.S.L. 14, p. 289 ff.

between a noun and before a verb[1] (ṚV. 2, 24, 11) could in cases such as TB. 3, 5, 3, 2 *agním á vaha* "bring Agni"; ṚV. 9, 86, 44 *áhir ná[2] júrṇám áti sarpati tvácam* "like a serpent he crept over (out of) his old skin"[3] contribute to the genesis of compound verbs 'governing' an oblique case. In the Ṛgveda a name and the epithets belonging to it may either occur in close succession or be separated by other elements.[4] By placing an epithet in a less common or isolated position, e.g. at the end of a stanza, a poet may throw it into relief. A single verb or a verb with its preverb not infrequently splits up a word group (ṚV. 1, 1, 1 *agním īḷe puróhitam* "Agni I praise (as) the purohita"; ŚŚS. 1, 17, 19 *imám á śṛṇudhī hávam* "hear this call"). It may be recalled that in principal clauses the verb was unaccented, but a certain inherited preference of such a verb for the second place was not the main factor:[5] an initial noun thrown into relief may be followed by the verb which in its turn may precede the predicate or a subjoined attribute. The subjects dealt with did not fail to exert some influence upon the order of words. The poets, for instance, liked to place words of contrasting meaning in close succession (ṚV. 7, 100, 5 *tavásam átavyān*).

The position of a word may also be conditioned by its length. After Pāṇini (2, 2, 34) Caland[6] drew attention to the fact that in dvandva compounds the rhythmic order of the members often prevails over the logical order; *darśa-pūrṇamāsau* "the sacrifices of Full and New Moon". Numberless instances may be given of Behaghel's so-called Gesetz der wachsenden Glieder (rather 'tendency of increasing length of co-ordinated sentence members'):[7] MānavaGS. 1, 17, 5 *aśmā bhava, paraśur bhava, hiraṇyam astṛtam bhava* "be a stone, be an axe, be indestructible gold".[8] Hence also combinations of adjectives and derivatives (AV. 5, 22, 3), the occurrence of a long word group at the end of the sentence (ṚV. 3, 22, 3), the suppression of an element in the first of two parallel clauses or word groups (ṚV. 10, 103, 3), verse structures such as ṚV. 7, 35, 14. The general ten-

---

[1] Delbrück, Grundriss, III (= Vergl. Syntax, I), p. 654 ff.

[2] Oldenberg, in Z.D.M.G. 61, p. 815 went too far in arguing that this *na* is always postponed.

[3] Most dissyllabic 'preverbs' are accented on their first syllable which corresponds to the so-called anastrophe in Greek (the initial position of the accent of a preposition following a noun).

[4] Gonda, Epithets in the Ṛgveda, The Hague 1959, p. 169.

[5] Hirt, IdG. Grammatik, VII, p. 263 erroneously regards the 'Zweitstellung' of the verb as the exclusive result of 'enclisis'. Cf. also Renou, in Symbolae linguisticae-G. Kuryłowicz, Wrocław 1965, p. 230 ff.

[6] Caland, A.O. 9 (1931), p. 59 ff. One should, in this connection, avoid the term 'rhetoric' used by W. Krause, in K.Z. 50, p. 97; cf. also p. 112.

[7] O. Behaghel, I.F. 25, p. 110 ff.

[8] Gonda, Repetition, p. 70 and passim.

dency is that an author completes the schema of a short sentence and then strings on one or more additions or modifications, which often assume the character of specifications or elucidations. Thus, long appositional groups often follow (ṚV. 1, 1, 1) a word group which would be a complete sentence by itself. However, a group of qualifications may also occur elsewhere. Attributes or other qualifications are often dismissed to the end of the utterance so as to follow a duplicated schema (ṚV. 3, 59, 2 *ná hanyate ná jīyate tvótaḥ* "he is not killed, not conquered, who is favoured by Thee").[1]

Another factor determining the order of words, or modifying an order which statistically might be expected, is the comparative importance of an element. One or more substantial words are often transposed epexegetically to a position after the verb: hence, the noun-subject in end position: TB. 2, 7, 16, 4 *úd asā́v etu sū́ryaḥ* "yonder sun must rise".[2] An adjective in this position may be so strong as to admit of a longer translation, for instance by a subordinate clause or a periphrasis (ṚV. 1, 85, 12 *rayíṃ no dhatta ... vṛ́ṣaṇaḥ suvī́ram* "give us wealth, O bulls, consisting of heroes"). However, the position of the verb (or of the predicate) improperly qualified as 'rhythmical' is mainly conditioned by the tendency to avoid long and complex syntactic structures (amplification, Nachtragstil),[3] for instance by placing a duplicated member of the sentence after its 'provisional' end marked by the verb: ṚV. 2, 12, 14 *yáḥ sunvántam ávati yáḥ pácantam* "he who assists him who presses, him who cooks".[4] With the exception of some indeclinables and enclitic pronouns monosyllables are at the end of a verse or sentence usually avoided unless they are given this position for reasons of emphasis.[5]

The rule formulated by Wackernagel[6]—and repeated by others—with regard to the position of the verb: "Altindisch, Latein und Litauisch stellen das Verbum regelmässig ans Ende des Satzes; man glaubt hierin eine Gewohnheit der Grundsprache erkennen zu können" was unfortunately, under the influence of Delbrück's[7] prejudices against the utilization of metrical texts for studies of this description, based on a limited number of prose works, which, being largely 'technical' and composed by learned specialists, abound in repetitions of the same sentence structures. It would however be an error of judgment to see[8] in that sacerdotal and

---

[1] Gonda, Repetition, p. 356.
[2] Bloomfield, in I.F. 31, p. 167.
[3] Gonda, Repetition, p. 355 ff.
[4] Gonda, ibidem, p. 68.
[5] Gonda, in A.O. 17, p. 123 ff.
[6] Wackernagel, I.F. 1, p. 427 (= Kleine Schriften, p. 95).
[7] Delbrück, Wortfolge, p. 1 f.; Altind. Syntax, p. 15.
[8] For instance, with J. Canedo, Zur Wort- und Satzstellung in der alt- und mittelin-

'philosophical' prose more than a special 'literary refraction' of the living language.[1] Less biased against metrical texts Speyer[2] made some exact and useful, though all too succint, remarks, but failed to distinguish between different genres of poetic diction. Other authors seem to have believed in the liberty of the poets to place their words where they liked to the point that they gave up any attempt at formulating tendencies.[3] From an investigation into the position of the verb by the present author[4] it however appeared that neither the fixity of the prose[5] nor the licence of the poets was so absolute as has been supposed and that on the contrary there are some distinct tendencies manifesting themselves to a greater or less degree in various genres of both prose and poetry. For instance, the initial position of the verb, though never predominant, is mainly found in the following cases:[6] the verb is an imperative, a form of the verb *asti* in the sense of "to exist, be present", a future or other form expressing an intention; it forms a part of an apodosis or 'virtual' apodosis; the clause is closely connected with the preceding clause (so-called Anschluszstellung); the verbal idea or the affirmative character or the verb is thrown into relief; the verbal idea is anaphorically repeated;[7] the verb introduces an interrogation, an exclamation, or in general an 'affective' sentence; this position may finally be an element of emphasis[8] or dramatization. The verb, being followed by the subject, recedes to the second place (inversion), if another, stronger, tendency causes another element of the sentence—e.g. an absolutive, absolute locative, causal ablative, participle—to move to the beginning, or when words which usually occupy other positions are placed at the end which in most texts is the most usual position of the verb. The frequent cases of mid position are however far from being homogeneous. Rhythm, the length of the sentence[9] and the relations to the preceding and following sentence may interfere. Preverbs not infrequently

---

dischen Prosa, Göttingen 1937, p. 11; see also Wackernagel, Indogermanische Dichtersprache, Philologus 95 (1943), p. 6 (= Kleine Schriften, p. 191).

[1] J. Gonda, Remarques sur la place du verbe dans la phrase active et moyenne en langue sanscrite, Utrecht 1952, p. 6. Cf. also Renou, Symbolae Kuryłowicz, p. 234: "La phrase védique n'exprime des   faits de langue que réfractés à travers des habitudes de style"; the same, in Die Sprache, 1, p. 11 f.

[2] Speyer, Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax, p. 76 f. Cf. also the same, Sanskrit syntax, p. 12 f.

[3] E. Thommen, Die Wortstellung im nachvedischen Altindischen, K.Z. 38, p. 504.

[4] Gonda, Remarques (see n. 1).

[5] Meillet, Introduction, p. 365.

[6] For inversion of subject and predicate see also H. Jacobi in I.F. 5, p. 335 ff. (= Kleine Schriften, Wiesbaden 1970, p. 1 ff.).

[7] Speyer, Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax, p. 77; Gonda, Repetition, p. 148 f.

[8] Macdonell, Vedic gr. f. stud., p. 284.

[9] M. Bloomfield, I.F. 31, p. 160: "Stability is in inverse ratio to the number of words in a sentence".

open the sentence, throwing into relief a qualification of the verbal idea and including with the verb the rest of the sentence or part of it;[1] this structure may be regarded as inherited.

Another element of many sentences, viz. the negative particles *ná* and *mā́*, was wrongly supposed[2] to be a part so intimately connected with the verb that it originally was placed immediately before that part of speech ("Verneinung der Verbalaussage"). Delbrück,[3] while being mostly interested in the prehistoric situation and omitting to study a large collection of texts, rightly claimed also another position for it, viz., "wenn die ganze Satzaussage negiert werden soll", the beginning of the sentence. His views were endorsed by Wackernagel.[4] Yet, Speyer[5] had, at an earlier date, argued that especially in metrical texts any other place is admissible and, after Delbrück, Thommen[6] appositely observed that the pertinent facts were more complicated than his predecessors had supposed them to be. From a study of a large collection of texts[7] it emerged, among other things, that, generally speaking, the particle *na* is placed immediately before the verb if the sentence is written in an objective and non-affective style; that, when it is the first word of a sentence, it often helps to express a more or less emotional reaction (opposition, contradiction, refusal).[8] Hence the preference for strong negations *(naiva, nāham)* in this position. If the sentence is 'introduced' by an accessory word *(ca, hí, vaí* etc.), *na* opening it precedes these subordinate elements without adding an emotional tinge to the statement.

With regard to the position of the attributive adjective in early prose Delbrück,[9] though right in stating that its stylistically neutral position in an objectively descriptive or attributive function is before the substantive, informs his readers very incompletely. Many of the numerous exceptions are explicable or, at least, worth studying.[10]

After some brief observations made by Delbrück[11] the amplified sentences and similar structures were studied by the present author.[12] In a

---

[1] See also Renou, in B.S.L. 34, p. 54.
[2] G. Neckel, in K.Z. 45, p. 1.
[3] Delbrück, Grundriss, IV (= Vergl. Syntax, II), p. 521; cf. also Altindische Syntax, p. 542.
[4] Wackernagel, Vorlesungen über Syntax, Basel ²1928, II, p. 248 ff. and esp. p. 259 ff.
[5] Speyer, Sanskrit Syntax, p. 315.
[6] Thommen, in K.Z. 38, p. 519 ff.
[7] Gonda, La place de la particule négative *na* dans la phrase en vieil indien, Leiden 1951.
[8] The combination *nāsti* "(there) is not" may be regarded as inherited: R. Thurneysen, in Zs. f. celtische Philologie, 1, p. 1 ff.
[9] Delbrück, Altindische Syntax, p. 19 f.
[10] Gonda, in B.D.R.I. 20 (1960), p. 303 ff.
[11] Delbrück, Wortfolge, p. 54 ff.
[12] Gonda, Four studies, chapter I.

considerable number of cases a sentence which is complete in itself is
amplified by words following the verb which may be left out without
mutilating it. To these amplifications belong, for instance, the dative of
purpose (TS. 5, 2, 6, 3 *vájram ... bhrā́tṛvyāya prá harati stṛ́tyai* "he hurls
the bolt at his rival, to lay (him) down"); the accusative in *-tum* or *-am*
supplementing statements containing a verb of motion or depending on
verbs meaning "to wish, to be able etc."; a predicative accusative (RV.
10, 7, 3 *agním manye pitáram* "I regard Agni as my father"); an accusative
of aim or destination, an apposition, explication, specification (epexegesis)
—which may be 'expressive' (ŚB. 14, 7, 1, 17 ... *pratiyony ā́ dravati bud-
dhāntā́yaivá* "he hastens to his place of origin, (i.e.) towards the state of
waking")[1]—a simile, and so on. Sometimes it is the following sentence
which leads an author to add a 'Schleppe'[2] in order to facilitate the
transition.

So the statement that the order of words was, in Old Indo-Aryan as
well as in the old Indo-European languages in general, "extremely free"[3]
may be modified as follows. With regard to the information imparted the
arrangement of words was largely non-connotative, but differences of order
were to a great extent dependent on context, situation, the exigencies of
rhythm, clearness, emphatic relief and other 'stylistic' factors. In the
variations of word order the ancient poets had command of an excellent
means of expressing manifold nuances in their thoughts and sentiments,
of welding the pādas of their verses together, underlining the significance
of some part of the utterance, or calling attention to definite connections
or relations. As observed by Bloomfield,[4] change in word order may have
something to do with varying degrees of emphasis. This is, for instance,
clear in concatenating pādas (RV. 1, 163, 3d *āhús te trī́ṇi diví bándhanāni*
is an emphatic assertion: "they say that thou hast three bonds in heaven",
the immediately following pāda 1, 163, 4a *trī́ṇi ta āhúr diví bándhanāni*
is a musing or reflective introduction to a further development of the
theme of the hymn). Part of these devices and arrangements of words
becoming 'mechanized', that is, realized in the form of fixed schemes,
tended to reduce the freedom of order to a considerable extent. Thus the
demonstrative pronoun is, also in metrical texts, only occasionally ousted
from its initial position by a word which is thrown into special relief.[5]
However, even in those frequent cases in which a special schema or a

---

[1] Minard, o.c., II, p. 48.
[2] Delbrück, Wortfolge, p. 56.
[3] Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 333.
[4] Bloomfield, Repetitions, p. 552.
[5] Cf. also Porzig, in I.F. 41, p. 251.

certain word order must be regarded as traditional and a product of mechanization it often was unmistakably rooted in more spontaneous linguistic usage. Although, therefore, the word order is not indifferent and in versified language by no means completely determined by the exigencies of rhythm and metre,[1] in the many mantra variants—always being the same sentence used in the same, or at least a similar, situation—variations in the order of words are far from infrequent.[2] A thorough study of these variants from the stylistic point of view—which cannot easily be distinguished from the psychological angle[3]—would be worth undertaking, because we should not reconcile ourselves to stating that these changes do not impart to the results any meaning which is not contained in the original.[4]

This brings us to questions of style. Although until recently the topic was largely neglected and our knowledge is, from the point of view of general linguistics, not yet very satisfactory, a study of the problems connected with the possibilities of selection, with the preference for, or avoidance of, definite sequences is not only attractive but also essential to a correct understanding of the technique of the ancient poets. It is true that the attention of Pischel and Geldner[5] was attracted by the phenomena of parallelismus membrorum and the "im Ṛgveda überaus beliebte Alliteration"[6] and their significance with regard to the order of words; that homoioteleuton and other stylistic 'devices' such as rhyme[7] and assonance had provoked the curiosity of Kaegi,[8] Aufrecht,[9] and Oldenberg,[10] this does not mean that these phenomena were exhaustively collected[11] or adequately explained and evaluated. It was observed that 'figures of speech', "though of rare occurrence in the most ancient writings" were

---

[1] In particular cases "unstable order of words is of course due to the hampering or confining influence of metre" (Bloomfield, Repetitions, p. 552).

[2] Bloomfield, in J.A.O.S. 29, p. 291 ff. and I.F. 31, p. 156 ff. As to similar transpositions in prose: Minard, o.c., I, p. 183. For chronological considerations: Renou, Introduction générale, p. 13 ff.

[3] As was supposed by H. Oertel, Zu den Wortstellungsvarianten der Mantras des Atharvaveda, München Acad. 1940, 7, p. 8 ff.; cf. Renou, in B.S.L. 42, II, p. 52 ff.

[4] Bloomfield, Repetitions, l.c. See also M. Bloomfield, F. Edgerton, M. B. Emeneau, Vedic variants, III, Philadelphia 1934, p. 18 ff.; A. Beth, Variatieverschijnselen in het Oud-Indisch, Thesis Utrecht 1943, p. 45 ff.

[5] Pischel-Geldner, Vedische Studien, II, Register and p. 214; 237; III, p. 90 n.

[6] Now see Gonda, Alliteration und Reim im Satzbau des Atharvaveda, in A.O. 18, p. 50 ff. and the same, Repetition, ch. VIII.

[7] Gonda, Repetition, ch. IX.

[8] A. Kaegi, Der Rigveda, Leipzig 1878 f., p. 33, n. 83a.

[9] Th. Aufrecht, in Z.D.M.G. 60, p. 57.

[10] Oldenberg, Noten, Indices (s.v. Syntax und Stilistik); the same, Die Literatur des alten Indiens, Stuttgart 1903, p. 208.

[11] For a collection see Macdonell, A Vedic reader for students, Oxford 1917, Index.

"rather unconsciously employed", because without them no language "can far advance";[1] there was some discussion on the possible influence of 'Sondersprachen';[2] scholars[3] were aware of the fact that the Veda had some stylistic features in common with the kāvya literature of the classical period.[4] For many years, the general tendency was, however, to qualify these features, if not as curious peculiarities, as "rhetoric", "figures of speech", "Lautmalerei", "artificial devices",[5] and, less inadequately, as "Freude an dem Gleichklang der Silben".[6] A serious imperfection of most statements was the implicit assumption that any element of a literary work which does not serve the matter-of-fact, intellectual exposition of the subject-matter is, to a greater or less extent, a redundancy, an ornament which may serve to emotional or intellectual enjoyment, but is no essential necessity of the argument or narrative.[7] Questions as to the function of these 'ornaments' or as to why a definite 'figure of speech' occurs in a given context were not put, and the artificiality of poetry —prose texts were hardly taken into account—was regarded as self-evident.

Yet, the Indians themselves had, by introducing for what in French is quite inadequately called 'fleurs de rhétorique' the term *alaṃkāra*,[8] given evidence of no mean insight into their essence and function: these 'ornaments' "make the products of an author's genius fit to meet certain, literary (aesthetic) or (and) religious requirements"; they substantially add to the impressiveness of the Vedic mantra texts, many of which could without them hardly have fulfilled the requirements of archaic prayers, invocations, or conjurations. An attempt to view these stylistic phenomena, as far as they exhibit some form of repetition, in the light of the principles and results of modern stylistics, was undertaken by the present author.[9] Most types of repetition—including parallelism of word-groups as well as mere repetition of sounds—are not unknown from other archaic literatures, whether Indo-European or foreign. There is a tendency to repetition of stock phrases and word groups, particularly in special

---

[1] P. V. Kane, in I.A. 41 (1912), p. 124 ff.; 204 ff. (cf. p. 124; 126).

[2] Ch. R. Lanman, in J.A.O.S. 20, p. 12; W. Porzig, in Festschrift-E. Sievers, Halle S. 1925, p. 646.

[3] E.g. Kane, o.c.

[4] D. R. Bhandarkar, in A volume of Studies presented to P.V. Kane, Poona 1941, p. 70 ff.

[5] Geldner, translation, passim, e.g. I, p. 202; 375.

[6] A. Hillebrandt, Kalidasa, Breslau 1921, p. 106 f. and n. 151.

[7] See e.g. G. R. Diwekar, Les fleurs de rhétorique dans l'Inde, Thesis Paris 1930.

[8] Gonda, in New Indian Antiquary, 1 (Bombay 1939), p. 97 ff.

[9] Gonda, Repetition. Parts of these phenomena were also discussed in a publication of smaller compass, Stilistische studie over Atharvaveda I-VII, Wageningen 1938.

parts of a stanza, such as the cadence.[1] Besides the 'Zwillingsformeln' in which in cases of isosyllabism—and sometimes also in other structures— the more important or 'proximate' idea tends to take precedence: ŚB. 3, 6, 2, 15 *gṛhán pásūn* "house and cattle",[2] there are, in the metrical texts, various other more or less rhythmic or symmetrical structures, forms of repetition, correspondence, or parallelism, which mutatis mutandis legitimate a comparison with similar 'poems' or pieces of prose composed to be solemnly recited in other ancient literatures ('carmen' style):[3] balanced binary word groups (ṚV. 10, 173, 4 *dhruvá dyaúr dhruvá pṛthiví* "fixed (is) heaven, fixed the earth")[4]—especially preserved in the ritual formulas of the Yajurveda—;[5] positive and negative expression of the same thought (PB. 1, 5, 5 *juṣasva lokam, mārvāg avagāḥ* "keep thy place, do not descend downward"); anaphora (AV. 1, 34, 3 *mádhuman me nikrámaṇam | mádhuman me paráyaṇam* "honeyed is my footstep, honeyed my going away"), including the disjunctive *yadi* ... (*yadi vā*);[6] responsio (internal repetition). It is beyond doubt that various patterns of recurrent phonemes, such as assonance;[7] figura etymologica;[8] polyptoton (the recurrence of the same word in another case form); explicative conduplication; paronomasia[9]— which may be emphatic in cases such as AV. 4, 36, 3 *sáhasā sahe* "I overpower with power or powerfully"[10] or otherwise[11] constitute a form of 'Ausdrucksverstärkung'[12] (AV. 5, 27, 2 *devéṣu deváḥ* "god par excellence among the gods") and should not be regarded as due to an eagerness, on the part of the authors, for puns or humoristic effects[13]—have, in Vedic antiquity, favoured the spread of many speech forms.

It can therefore hardly be disputed that Vedic literature, and especially the mantras, is highly formulaic, and increasingly conventional, in

---

[1] Bloomfield, Repetitions, p. 10 ff.

[2] Krause, in K.Z. 50, p. 77 ff.; esp. p. 94 ff.; 110 ff.

[3] Gonda, o.c., ch. II.

[4] Oldenberg, Altind. Prosa, p. 2 ff.

[5] Krause's characterization as "schlichte, primitiv-unbeholfene Sprache" (K.Z. 50, p. 79) should not be subscribed to.

[6] Delbrück, Altind. Syntax, p. 584 ff.

[7] See also Oldenberg, Noten, I, p. 87; 209; 236; Renou, E.V.P. I, p. 58 ff.

[8] Gaedicke, Akkusativ, p. 237 ff.

[9] Cf. Minard, o.c., II, p. 62; 94.

[10] Delbrück, Grundriss, III, p. 256 f.

[11] Keith, in J.R.A.S. 1909, p. 428 ff.

[12] H. Oertel, Zum altindischen Ausdrucksverstärkungstypus *satyasya satyam* (explained as "die Quintessenz des Wahren"), München Acad. 1937, 3; cf. also F. Specht, in K.Z. 62, p. 245; E. Hofmann, Ausdrucksverstärkung, Göttingen 1930, p. 49.

[13] Thus e.g. Bloomfield, Hymns of the Atharva-veda, Oxford 1897, p. 703. Meillet, in M.S.L. 18, p. 245 was, on the other hand, mistaken in stating that many paronomastic phrases are learned or artificial.

character. Oldenberg[1] even spoke of "hieratische Strenge der Formen". This poetry is to a considerable extent imitative,[2] because the poets, drawing on the traditions of the oral literature of their milieus, and the reciters, relying on their memory, easily "fell into habits of expression such that entire lines of different stanzas or hymns, and considerable sequences of words of different prose passages, show much similarity".[3] This is, however, not to say that various forms of stylistic variation are foreign to these texts.[4] Beside several types of chiasmus,[5] which is rather frequent, also to throw some element of the utterance into relief[6] or to mark a contrast or opposition, there is, also in prose, a frequent use of synonyms[7] (Chāndogya-Upaniṣad 1, 2, 2 *surabhi ca durgandhi ca* "the sweet smelling and the foul smelling"), 'euphemistic' variants[8] and of more complex forms of variation. Not infrequently, two forms of the same value alternate in accordance with metrical requirements (e.g. ṚV. 7, 71, 1d—2c)[9]. There is, moreover, an almost unlimited choice of combinations of word groups and other units. The frequency of compounds is largely a question of style. Whereas there is in the Ṛgveda about one compound as against 30 other words (or 16, if accessory words are left out of consideration), their number is higher in descriptive or emphatic passages.[10] Instead of real compounds we also find cases of asyndetic juxtaposition of two nouns (e.g. ṚV. 1, 65, 6 *síndhur ná kṣódaḥ* "like a river (its) stream").[11] One of the most typical features of the style of the metrical texts is the ease with which syntactic groups of various structure are linked together so as to constitute larger or complex sentences (RV. 7, 61, 4 *áyan mā́sā áyajvanām avī́rāḥ | prá yajñámanmā vṛjánaṃ tirāte* "that the months of non-sacrificers pass without sons; that he whose heart is set on sacrifice extend his circle"; 2, 12, 2 *yáḥ ..., yáḥ ..., yó ..., yó dyā́m ástabhnāt, sá janāsa índraḥ* "who

[1] Oldenberg, Prolegomena, p. 101.

[2] For the imitative and mechanical character of Vedic literary products see also Bloomfield, in J.A.O.S. 29, p. 287. Geldner's pertinent remarks (Vedische Studien, II, p. 151 f.) are now in need of modification.

[3] Bloomfield, A Vedic concordance, Cambridge Mass. 1906, p. VII.

[4] Beth, o.c.

[5] Gonda, Repetition, ch. V.

[6] Delbrück, Wortfolge, p. 59 f.

[7] Beth, o.c., p. 48 ff.

[8] Oertel, Euphemismen in der vedischen Prosa und ... in den Mantras, München Acad. 1943, p. 8.

[9] Zubatý, in W.Z.K.M. 2 (1888), p. 133.

[10] Renou, in Language, 29, p. 231.

[11] A. Bergaigne, La syntaxe des comparaisons védiques, in Mélanges-L. Rénier, Paris 1887, p. 75 ff. ("construction des termes communs dans la comparaison; concordance; rapport des termes de comparaison entre eux"). Renou, in Language 29, p. 234 f. There is no question of "Attraktion des Genitivs an das regierende Nomen" (Geldner, Translation, I, p. 87).

..., who ..., who ..., who supported heaven, he, O men, is Indra"). That the diction of the poets could sometimes follow the lofty flight taken by their imagination may appear from ṚV. 1, 124, 2 *áminatī daívyāni vratáni praminatī́ manuṣ̀yā̀ yugáni | īyúṣīṇām upamā́ śáśvatīnām | āyatīnám prathamóṣā́ vỳ adyaut* "without violating the divine ordinances, reducing the ages of men, Dawn has shone forth as the last of many who have passed by, as the first of those who are to come".

However, this is not all. Some of the above 'figures of speech' and, in addition to these, a tendency to accumulate adjectives (ṚV. 1, 91, 20; 4, 2, 5),[1] epithets and so-called synonyms; to use more or less synonymous verbs with different constructions;[2] to resume a term occurring at the beginning of a stanza through epithets and other qualifications swelling into one long sentence (ṚV. 10, 140, 6); to resort to variant word forms; to insert what may seem to be superfluities or vocatives functioning "comme une sorte de renvoi, de répercussion emphatique à la chose énoncée";[3] an excessive use of superlatives[4] and other encomiastic devices are, in many places, unmistakable indications of what has rightly been called 'hypercharacterisation'.[5] "La langue du Ṛgveda oscille entre deux pôles contraires, densité et surabondance: des tendences opposées coexistent, entre lesquelles s'établit un point d'équilibre sans cesse menacé". This 'densité', moreover, often changes into an interruption of a 'normal' syntactic structure. Still it would be interesting to know the impression this style made on the poets' contemporaries. It is easier to express the opinion that the social and religious situation[6] must have considerably determined this style than to state to what extent this has been the case. That, on the other hand, the similes and metaphors had not only an aesthetic and 'expressive', but also a religious function is beyond any doubt. It is, moreover, clear that our conceptions of 'metaphor' are not applicable to these texts; what impresses us as 'figurative language' may not infrequently be intimately connected with the poets' religion or view of life and the world.[7] After Bergaigne,[8] who, misjudging the similes as features

---

[1] W. Wüst, in Z.D.M.G. 80 (1926), p. 161 ff. and Stilgeschichte und Chronologie des Ṛgveda, Leipzig 1928 speaks of 'Schwellstil', a characterization perfectly applicable to his own style. The disputable chronological conclusions of his book (which is an attempt at combining aesthetic and chronological points of view) need not detain us.

[2] Renou, in Die Sprache, 1, p. 11 ff.

[3] Renou, E.V.P. I, p. 62.

[4] Cf. also Gonda, Repetition, p. 245; 265.

[5] Renou, E.V.P. I, p. 45 ff.; see p. 46.

[6] For some exaggerated views: Wüst, in Z.D.M.G., l.c.

[7] Renou, Maîtres, p. 24 f. H. Weller, in Z.I.I. 5, p. 178 ff. whose proposal (p. 184) to distinguish between various types of metaphors is hardly workable.

[8] A. Bergaigne, in M.S.L. 4, p. 96 ff.

of a "rhétorique bizarre", was mainly interested in their outward appearance, and Hirzel[1] who collected them according to their material contents, an attempt was ventured[2] to make a more comprehensive survey of their possibilities and to interpret them in the light of a modern theory of stylistics: they may occur for economical reasons, from motives of tact, caution, or expressiveness to underline "das sinnlich Eindrucksvolle", to promote 'Anschaulichkeit', to express emotion, to form a climax (AV. 4, 12, 6) or mark culminating points (AiB. 8, 25, 1);[3] many similes must be explained from the close relations between man and nature, may have a magical force, are petrified or mere amplifications. The influence of a bent for irony,[4] humorous playfulness on the part of the poets has however often been much exaggerated.[5] The differences between the texts in the use of figurative language were sometimes underestimated.[6]

A discussion of the question as to how far some features of this style are inherited from the prehistoric predecessors of the poets would lie beyond the scope of this work. It may suffice to recall that many of them return in the Avesta and in other ancient Indo-European literatures,[7] a fact which should not make us overlook the possibility of secondary parallel origin as well as the non-Indo-European occurrences of the same or similar syntactic and stylistic characteristics. For a full and amply documented treatment of all that is known or supposed to be known about prehistoric—which does not necessarily mean 'urindogermanisches'—poetic language the reader may be referred to R. Schmitt's recent book,[8] whose argumentations and conclusions, however, do not in every detail and in all respects carry conviction.[9]

From the linguistic point of view the brāhmaṇas,[10] though composed and

---

[1] A. Hirzel, Gleichnisse und Metaphern im Ṛgveda in culturhistorischer Hinsicht zusammengestellt, Thesis Leipzig 1890; C. R. Lanman, in J.A.O.S. 20, p. 12 ff.

[2] Gonda, Remarks on similes in Sanskrit literature, Leiden (1939) 1949. Cf. also A. Venkatasubbiah, in A.L.B. 28, p. 161 ff.

[3] H. Oldenberg, Die Lehre der Upanishaden, Göttingen ²1923, p. 157 ff.

[4] A. Ludwig, in Festgrusz-O. v. Böhtlingk, 1888, p. 82 ff.

[5] Gonda, in Orientalia Neerlandica, Leiden 1948, p. 312 ff.

[6] For the so-called gāthās: P. Horsch, Die vedische Gāthā und Śloka-Literatur, Bern 1966, p. 357 ff.

[7] Gonda, Repetition, ch. II and passim and the books and articles mentioned p. 57, n. 98; E. Benveniste, Phraséologie poétique de l'indo-iranien, Mélanges-Renou, Paris 1968, p. 73 ff.

[8] R. Schmitt, Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit, Wiesbaden 1967. Compare also W. Wüst, Von indogermanischer Dichtersprache, PHMA, 12, München 1969.

[9] See my review in Lingua, 23, p. 301 ff., H. Humbach, in M.S.S. 21, p. 21 and V. Pisani, in Archivio glottologico Italiano 51 (1966), p. 105 ff. (= V. Pisani, Lingue e culture, Brescia 1969, p. 347 ff.).

[10] H. Oldenberg, Zur Geschichte der altindischen Prosa, Göttingen Acad. 16, 6 (Berlin 1917); the same, Zur Geschichte des altindischen Erzählungsstils, G.G.N. 1919, p. 61 ff.

handed down in different milieus, exhibit, generally speaking, the same usage. Some archaisms are gradually superseded, some stylistic peculiarities unequally distributed. Often denied any high level as regards its style,[1] their as a rule simple and grammatically precise prose is in the main sufficiently clear, but sometimes too brief and allusive or even obscure. Free from long compounds and preference for passive turns of speech it abounds in absolute constructions. Incidentally the use of oratio recta may lend it a certain air of vividness, but normally the structure of the sentences lacks variety. Long series of short clauses are quite common. There are awkward changes of subject, ellipses and incomplete formulations. Although similes are not entirely absent, the very nature of the subject-matter prevents the authors from indulging their hearers with some evidence of humour or pathos. Conciseness and monotony are the main characteristics of the yajus and excessive brevity of the sūtras, but even these works are not completely devoid of alliteration, variation or emphatic positions of words. Many features of this style are no doubt attributable to the oral transmission and explanation of these works and to the requirements of the special dialectics adopted and developed by the ancient teachers in discussing their technical subjects.[2] Hence also some 'mnemotechnical' devices and a distinct predilection for various forms of repetition, for instance for facilitating the transition to a following sentence. The occurrence of the same word in both a principal and a subordinate clause may add to the clearness and solemnity of a passage,[3] it no doubt is a popular and 'sondersprachliches' feature. The widespread concatenation and recapitulative sentence connection—occurring in various types—e.g. Chāndogya-Upaniṣad 4, 16, 3 *evam asya yajño riṣyati, yajñaṃ riṣyantaṃ yajamāno 'nuriṣyati* "... even so is his sacrifice injured; when the sacrifice is injured, the sacrificer is injured also"—should not be considered a rhetorical[4] or merely aesthetic and mnemotechnic device, because it is also characteristic of the narrative style of the common people who like to have such resting-places and stepping stones.[5] Various types

---

[1] See e.g. Keith, Rigveda brāhmaṇas, Cambridge Mass. 1920, p. 96 ff.; the same, The Veda of the Black Yajus School, p. CLVII ff.

[2] See also Renou, Histoire de la langue sanskrite, Lyon-Paris 1956, p. 41 ff.; for the āraṇyakas Keith, The Aitareya Āraṇyaka, Oxford 1909 (1969), p. 52 ff.; for the upaniṣads Oldenberg, o.c., p. 28 ff.; for the sūtras the bibliographical note in Renou, Introduction générale, p. 70 f.; M. Leumann, in Asiatische Studien, 18-19 (1965), p. 207 ff. From another point of view: Renou, Les connexions entre le rituel et la grammaire en sanskrit, J.A. 233, p. 105 ff.

[3] Delbrück, Altind. Syntax, p. 559; 563 f.; Renou, Grammaire védique, p. 386; Gonda, Repetition, p. 302 ff.

[4] Bloomfield, The Atharva-Veda and the Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa, Strassburg 1899, p. 43.

[5] Gonda, Repetition, p. 296 ff.; 316 ff.

of resumption (AiB. 3, 1, 1 ... *stuvate. stute stome* ... "they celebrate. When the eulogium has been sung") and catenary structures (e.g. AiB. 6, 19, 7) may be viewed in the same light. Catenary structure of stanzas was already in the metrical texts a favourite practice.[1]

---

[1] M. Bloomfield, Rig-Veda repetitions, Cambridge Mass. 1916, p. 5 ff.

CHAPTER SIX

THE VOCABULARY

Roth was, in his contributions to the Petersburg Dictionary, the first to pursue a line of lexicographic investigation with a view to a complete and systematic inventory of the Vedic vocabulary.[1] Confronted with an almost endless number of problematic interpretations and uncertain significations he was often under the practical necessity of contenting himself with rather general meanings apparently suiting a number of similar texts. In this pioneer work he was as a rule inclined to rely upon his intuition and his profound knowledge of the texts then available rather than the support which could have been derived from the indigenous commentators and lexicographers or from modern comparative linguists. He was right in that the results reached by the latter were often of a tentative character and the data furnished by the former, not rarely, obviously wrong, contradictory or mutually exclusive. Of the many so-called emendations of the text which he took the liberty to propose, only a very few had, with good reason, the approval of Oldenberg[2] and still less find favour in the eyes of the present generation of Vedists.

Grassmann's Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda has for long years been, and—if consulted with prudence—still is, an excellent handbook, cataloguing forms, phrases and occurrences, but the translations added to this useful material are generally speaking still more disputable than those given in the Petersburg Dictionary. Apart from the then unavoidable shortcomings Grassmann did not even scruple to assume basic or central meanings which are found nowhere or only in later texts. The short explanations added to his many translations impress us not rarely as products of phantasy.[3]

So the translations of many Vedic words as they are given in these great dictionaries are either open to controversy or unquestionably incorrect. The pioneers are not to blame for this. They have laid all students of Sanskrit and Indo-European linguistics under a heavy obligation and could not foresee what would be discovered by those who stand on their shoulders. Their very inadequate understanding of the texts as well as

[1] In the second edition of Bopp's Glossarium sanscritum (Berlin 1830; 1847; 1867) some Vedic material was utilized.

[2] Oldenberg, Noten.

[3] See e.g. sub voce *arc-* (110).

Vedic religion and society, the lack of any reliable semantic method, the reliance placed in the imperfect comparative methods of their days, the apparent plurivalent character of many Indian terms, often led them astray. So one of the weakest points of the method applied by Roth and Grassmann was the boldness with which they multiplied the senses of one and the same word even to the neglect of any semantic probability.

The much used dictionary compiled by Monier-Williams (1872; a new and enlarged edition in 1899; afterwards reprinted) was notwithstanding its different arrangement heavily indebted to the Petersburg Dictionary so as to instil, up to the present day, its errors into the minds of every successive generation of Sanskrit students. Some minor lexicons compiled for the use of beginners[1] may be omitted, but mention should be made of the insertion of some original Vedic material in Apte's dictionary,[2] of the quotations in Tarkavacaspati's voluminous production[3] and especially of the important undertaking launched by the Viśveśvarānanda Research Institute whose Vedic word-concordance ("being a universal register of Vedic vocabulary")—supplying us with many forms and occurrences but omitting translations—with companion volumes (grammatical word-in-dices etc.) has proved a most valuable and indispensable mine of information for every Vedist[4], although it must be admitted that it is not free from strange lacunae and omissions.

From Neisser's unfinished publication[5] and some meritorious collections of hitherto 'unknown' words[6] it was evident that already in the twenties or thirties Vedic lexicographers could have considerably improved upon the work done by their predecessors. Nowadays a descriptive and explicative Vedic lexicon[7] gathering all that has in the last century been contributed to the elucidation of the vocabulary, is, as will appear also from the following pages, an urgent necessity, the more so as a considerable part of the relevant publications is inaccessible in many places.[8]

---

[1] C. Cappeller in a German (1887) and English (1891) edition; A. A. Macdonell (1893).

[2] V. S. Apte, Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Bombay 1891 (1924; Poona 1957).

[3] T. Tarkavachaspati, Vācaspatya, Calcutta 1873-1884 (Benares 1962).

[4] Viśvabandhu Śāstri, Vaidika-Padānukramakoṣa or Vedic word-concordance, Hoshiarpur (at first Lahore) 1935 ff.; hitherto published: Saṃhitās (6 volumes); Brāhmaṇas (2 volumes); Upaniṣads (2 volumes); Vedāṅgas (4 volumes), etc.

[5] W. Neisser, Zum Wörterbuch des Ṛgveda, in A.K.M., Leipzig 1924, a- —auśāná- (encumbered by verbosity and many superfluities), and 1930 (up to gh and addenda).

[6] L. Renou, Index védique, in Journal of Vedic studies, 1; 2 Lahore 1934 f.; the same in Vāk, 5, p. 74 ff. and especially A. Sharma, Beitraege zur vedischen Lexikographie, PHMA, 5/6, München 1959/60 (contains about 1500 'new' words).

[7] Special explanatory vocabularies such as e.g. A. A. Macdonell and A. B. Keith, Vedic Index, 2 vol. London 1912 (Benares 1958) and Renou, Vocabulaire du rituel védique, Paris 1954 cannot be considered here.

[8] For some observations in connection with a planned Sanskrit Thesaurus see Renou in Vāk, 1, p. 88 ff.

It has indeed justly been observed[1] that our lexicons contain even some disconcerting mistranslations of oft-recurring words which obviously indicated common and concrete objects that must have been familiar to the ancient Indians. One of these words is *haṃsá-* which, though meaning "the goose" and nothing else[2]—a conclusion based on ornithological evidence as well as the data furnished by decorative art—is almost ineradicably translated by "swan" or "flamingo", some dictionaries even giving these names cumulatively and adding "or other aquatic bird".[3] There is a considerable variation in the rendering of *makara-*, Monier-Williams holding it to be "a kind of sea-monster (sometimes confounded with the crocodile, shark, dolphin)". The translation "crocodile" is however the correct one; it is from this animal that the well-known decorative motif has originated.[4]

Contrary to the method adopted by Roth and Grassmann, Bergaigne,[5] being of the opinion that the poets of the Ṛgveda—to whom he confined his inquiries—expressed their ritual-mythological themes in a highly complicated symbolical language, boldly but one-sidedly exerted himself in penetrating into the secrets of that language. Thus it was his conviction that the polysemy which was so characteristic of the German lexicography is largely fictitious; the Ṛgveda rather abounds in homogeneous complexes of metaphors. In his opinion the word *gó-* "cow" is for instance not only the normal substitute of "dawn" or "offering" but is—on account of the poets' view of the world—also meant in its proper sense in all those cases where other interpreters attach to it metonymic senses such as "cow's skin", "bow-string", "milk" etc. That means that Bergaigne was largely inclined to assume the existence of a special vocabulary produced and used by the Vedic priests and poets also in those cases which are generally regarded as more or less normal and occasional metaphors. Although it is true that for instance *sūnú-* "son" often denotes the idea of "representative of an idea"—e.g. *sunúḥ sáhasaḥ* "son of conquering power", i.e. the god of Fire[6]—Bergaigne no doubt overshot the mark in interpreting terms of relationship generally as references to natural phenomena etc. Whereas the different senses of the term *arká-* "ray", "sun", "song", "hymn" are

---

[1] J. Ph. Vogel, in B.S.O.A.S. 20, p. 561.

[2] Vogel, ibidem and especially the same, The goose in Indian literature and art, Leiden 1962.

[3] See Monier-Williams.

[4] Thus N. Stchoupak, L. Nitti, L. Renou, Dictionnaire sanskrit-français, Paris 1932, p. 542.

[5] A. Bergaigne, La religion védique d'après les hymnes du Rig-Veda, Paris 1878-1883 (1963); cf. e.g. I, p. 34 ff.

[6] Gonda, Some observations on the relations between gods and powers in the Veda, The Hague 1957.

up to the present day[1] considered a knotty point, Bergaigne, making the most of the opportunities the texts might seem to offer, was firmly convinced of their unity in the meaning "hymn".[2] Although his view of the Vedic vocabulary could in many respects have counterbalanced the interpretations proposed by Roth and his successors, there is no denying that it was as dogmatical and often untenable as it was consistent and original. He did not however fail to open the eyes to the stamp of priestly artificiality, or rather unnaturalness, which the words and phrases of this oldest document so often seem to bear.

The problem indeed remains as to how far the ancient poets borrowed from the common vocabulary of their times or introduced or propagated a terminology of their own; how far they may be supposed to have modified the force of words or transferred their meanings; and in what particular cases they did so. Opinions are likewise divided with regard to the difficult question as to how far they liked to attach a double sense or, in special cases, a cryptical second sense or—as was not rarely the opinion of Renou[3]—a deliberate ambiguity to the words used. It has no doubt been rightly emphasized that Vedic terms often are felt to be unitary in acceptation; if one of their senses is predominant in a passage, another may yet be present as an implication. But were the poets themselves in every case conscious of this 'polysemy'? That the frequent correlations or identifications of wordly events and entities with their heavenly prototypes etc. induced the poets to use the same word in two (or even three) senses which from their point of view are one—e.g. *ádri*- "rock, heavenly mountain, stone for pounding soma stalks" and other words used in connection with the soma[4]—is beyond doubt, and also that a considerable number of terms relating to the rites, the structure of the sacrificial place etc. had also an 'indirect value' or a 'symbolical intention'. Renou, showing that even a word such as *púriṣa*- "the loose earth or rubbish (of the sacrificial place)" was affected by this tendency, so as to assume some second meanings, goes so far as to speak of "un mot empreint sans doute d'une aura poétique".[5] It is no doubt true that many Vedic words conveyed connotations or expressed an emotional value not difficult to understand in the Vedic milieu,[6] but how are we—at least nowadays, with many strenuous efforts to understand these difficulties in front of us—to be

---

[1] See e.g. Neisser, o.c., I, p. 104 ff.; Renou, E.V.P. VII, p. 59; X, p. 91.
[2] For a discussion see Renou, Maîtres, p. 34 f.
[3] See e.g. Renou, Études sur le vocabulaire du Ṛgveda, Paris 1958, p. 38.
[4] I refer to H. Lüders, Varuṇa, Göttingen 1951-1959, p. 202 ff.
[5] Renou, in I.I.J. 4, p. 104 ff.
[6] See e.g. Renou, Études, passim.

certain in every particular case?[1] Who can tell how far a poet was, every time he uses an important word, so much preoccupied with its 'latent' senses[2] that we should adopt a special translation?

Although he joined Bergaigne in depending on internal evidence and ignored the indigenous learning, Oldenberg had a keener eye for details and nuances, for stylistic and phraseological particulars, for various semantic possibilities. His critical acumen led him for instance to distinguish between two homonymous verb forms *járate*, whereas Bergaigne had opined that the ideas of "singing" and "awaking" are so near as to admit of being expressed by one word.[3] Realizing the possibilities of a semi-primitive culture Oldenberg contributed many valuable observations on semantic problems overlooked by his predecessors.

Inaugurating their new method Pischel and Geldner[4] repeatedly attacked, in studying the meaning of words, Grassmann as well as the comparative linguists, who in their opinion could contribute only a few suggestions, as contrasted with the indigenous commentators and lexicographers whose works should be carefully scrutinized in search of valuable notes and observations supposed to be based on more or less authentic tradition. In their zeal for an Indian Ṛgveda Geldner tried to find the *nyagrodha-* "ficus indica" in the adjective *nīcína-* "downward"[5] and Pischel went so far as to claim the meaning "elephant" for a word *(ápsas-)* which up to his time was by others held to denote "the cheek", "forehead" or "breast".[6] A more radical deviation from the current opinions was Pischel's conviction that *soma-* had always denoted the moon.[7] Whereas, it is true, his interpretations of difficult words and passages were sometimes real improvements, his propensity for placing reliance in the Indian tradition of later times often proved a source of error. In choosing from the explanations of a difficult term suggested by the indigenous tradition one which seemed to suit a number of occurrences and in regarding this meaning, especially when it recurs in the post-Vedic language, not only as well attested and genuine but also as the basis of other senses one may hit the mark but also go astray. Translating[8] *rad-* "to scratch, cut, open

---

[1] I also refer to Oldenberg, Noten, I, p. 64 f.; II, p. 379.
[2] Cf. Renou, E.V.P. I, p. 1 ff.
[3] I refer to Renou, Maîtres, p. 69 f.
[4] Pischel und Geldner, Vedische Studien.
[5] Geldner, Vedische Studien I, p. 113 ff.
[6] Pischel, Vedische Studien I, p. 308 ff.; joining Sāyaṇa on RV. 8, 45, 5.
[7] Pischel, Vedische Studien I, p. 80; II, p. 242; cf. A. Hillebrandt, Vedische Mythologie, I, Breslau 1891, p. 269 ff. See Gonda, Change and continuity in Indian religion, The Hague 1965, ch. II.
[8] Geldner, Vedische Studien, III, p. 26.

(a path)" as if it were a synonym of the classical Sanskrit *vi-likh-* "to scratch; to write", substituting the latter meaning where the former would suit the context well and concluding from these assumptions that the art of writing was known to the ancient poets is an inadmissible procedure. It was Geldner himself who, getting on in years, mitigated this rigorous method and made a—largely hopeless—attempt to distinguish between those elements in the indigenous tradition which were really reliable and those which, being founded on 'etymologies', could in most cases be dispensed with.[1]

It is however beyond question that in many cases the Indian tradition is not authentic. Among those words which were already obscure in meaning in Yāska's times (about V[th] cent. B.C.) is for instance *śiprā-*, known almost exclusively from the Ṛgveda. Whereas Yāska gives us the option between "cheek" and "nose", modern translations are, in addition to these, "lip", "visor", "hair", "diadem" etc. As however the occurrences in the texts point to a twofold sense, viz. "a sort of ornament worn on the head" and a "definite part of the head" it seems expedient to think of two objects which have a striking characteristic in common, and so it was argued that the word can denote the "flying or fluttering crest (of a helmet)" as well as a "moustache", both of them moving in the same way, an explication which was corroborated by etymological considerations (the word can be related to *śepa-* "penis",[2] which does not exclude the meaning "horn").

It is, to add another instance, easily intelligible that Indian commentators explained the in their times obsolete word *pájas-*, when used in connection with Agni, by "brightness, fiery energy", although in other cases they preferred "force, strength", for it was only after many and different suggestions (e.g. "Helle; Heiterkeit, Frische", Petr. Dict.; "Kraft; Redegewalt; Glanz", Geldner; "Lichtglanz", Wackernagel-Debrunner; "surface, face", Mayrhofer; "forme, masse", Renou etc.) that with the help of fresh Middle Iranian material[3] the last-mentioned 'basic value' could be modified into the more satisfactory "body with particular reference to height, solidness etc.",[4] which in Agni's case comes to this "solid mass of flames".

---

[1] Cf. Renou, Maîtres, p. 51.

[2] Hj. Frisk, in M.O. 30 (1936), p. 78 ff.; S. A. Dange, in Journal Ganganatha Jha Res. Inst. 25 (1969), p. 501.

[3] Studied by H. W. Bailey and V. I. Abaev; see Atkins (note 4).

[4] S. D. Atkins, in J.A.O.S. 85 (1965), p. 9 ff. This means also that an etymological relation to words for "lustre, brightness" (Walde-Pokorny, Wörterbuch, II, p. 664) is to be rejected.

Some light may often be shed on the origin of an ancient pseudo-meaning of an old word which had fallen into disuse after the Ṛgvedic period: *yahú-* "young(est), lastborn" was in the Nighaṇṭu entered among the terms for water or power, with which it was associated by the poets of the Ṛgveda.[1] That is however not to contend that all traditional interpretations, even if they are incorrect, should be completely ignored. The explication of *mantra-*, though etymologically obviously a failure, is not devoid of value because it elucidates the opinions of those adepts and adherents of religious doctrines or traditions who believe sacred formulas to be an essential element in their endeavour to attain to a higher level of perfection: "that which saves (an incorrect connection with *trā-* "to save") the one who, in thought, formulates it, meditates on it *(man-)*".

In many cases however the discussion of vexed semantic problems by Western scholars reveals their indebtedness—to a certain degree—to the Indian tradition as well as their dissatisfaction with that tradition. Not rarely we are nowadays in a position to state the meaning of a word more exactly than the ancient interpreters who often liked to furnish their readers either with some occasional synonyms or with a general idea under which the meaning of the term in discussion can, in their opinion, be subsumed. Broadly speaking Indian commentators were right in attributing the general sense of "evil" *(pāpa-)* to a group of words deriving from the root *aṃh-*, but on closer investigation it appears that these words *(áṃhas-* etc.) denoted various aspects of the much feared conception of "narrowness" which—in opposition to the likewise important broadness[2]— implied such ideas as "distress, straitened circumstances ritually, psychically, economically, politically etc.".[3] Our expanded knowledge and modern methods not rarely enable us, on the other hand, to improve upon ancient explications. There has been some controversial discussion on *nagnikā-* which was variously explained by the Indian commentators[4] "a girl before the marriageable age": was she (in accordance with an at first sight acceptable translation) allowed to go naked? Other uses of ancient I.E. words for "naked" may show the way to a more satisfactory solution. Gr. γυμνός may also stand for "beardless", Lat. *nudus* for "without hair", hence, probably *nagnikā-* "without pubic hair".[5] The explication of *śraddhā́-* (according to Sāyaṇa "a high degree of care or regard") as I.E.

---

[1] Renou, in B.S.O.A.S. 20, p. 475 ff.
[2] For which see Gonda, Aspects of early Viṣṇuism, Utrecht 1954, p. 68 ff.
[3] Gonda, in I.I.J. 1 (1957), p. 33 ff.
[4] For particulars see P. V. Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, II, Poona 1941, p. 440 f.
[5] P. Thieme, in K.Z. 78, p. 178.

kred-dhē- lit. "to set one's heart on"[1] was, after distrustful criticism on the part of prominent scholars,[2] upheld again[3] because a reconsideration of the relevant texts showed that the above basic meaning is an acceptable starting-point for the contextual senses of "faithful trust or confidence" (in gods, their power, in authorities such as a priest, spiritual guide[4] etc.) and a corresponding disposition and behaviour.

The indigenous explication of *adhvará*- "sacrificial ceremony" as "not injuring" *(a-dhvara-)*[5]—cf. also Petr. Dict.: "was nicht gestört werden darf"—is untenable;[6] the word is etymologically related to *ádhvan*- "way, journey",[7] not, however as "feierlicher Gang" > "Feier, Zeremonie"[8]— which is one of those notorious superficial and regrettable attempts to account for semantic shifts— but, rather, in virtue of the belief that there was a way to lead *(ádhvan-)* the sacrificer to heaven and of the well-known conviction that the sacrifice *(adhvará-*, which must be of adjectival origin)[9] was the vehicle[10] to convey him and his merits to that destination.[11]

The noun *upástha*- "lap, female genitals", which is rather to be explained as *upas-tha*- (cf. the locative *upás-i* "in the lap"),[12] was considered to derive from *upa* and *sthā*- "to stand near" *(upastham : upasthānam)*;[13] similarly Sāyaṇa: *samīpasthāna*- "place in the vicinity, the being near"; Monier-Williams: "the place which is under, lap". Very often a plurality of explanations, each of which could illustrate an aspect of the concept denoted, were left to the reader's choice: *cakra*- "wheel": *carati* "to move" (this is right, Monier-Williams adds an interrogation-mark), *cak*- "to tremble"; *kram*- "to step, walk".[14] For obvious reasons indigenous grammarians and lexicographers were as a rule averse to recognizing the intrusion of foreign elements. Thus the etymologically puzzling *bāla*- "young; child" was incorrectly held to represent either a combination of

---

[1] J. Darmesteter, Études iraniennes, Paris 1883, II, p. 120; W. Caland, in K.Z. 31, p. 272. Cf. P. Hacker, in Wiener Zs.f.d. Kunde Süd-Asiens, 7, p. 151.

[2] See Walde-Pokorny, Wörterbuch, I, p. 423 f.; A. Walde-J. B. Hofmann, Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, I, Heidelberg 1938, p. 287.

[3] H. W. Köhler, Śraddhā, (unpublished) thesis Göttingen 1948.

[4] Oldenberg, in Z.D.M.G. 50 (1896), p. 448 ff. (= K.S. p. 26 ff.).

[5] Cf. also Uhlenbeck, Wörterbuch, p. 6 f.

[6] Neisser, o.c., I, p. 31 was already in doubt.

[7] On the assumption of an ancient *-r/n-* stem.

[8] K. F. Johansson, in I.F. 8 (1898), p. 180 ff.; followed by Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, I, p. 32 and others.

[9] See also Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 147; wrongly rejected by Neisser, Wörterbuch, I, p. 31.

[10] Cf. Oldenberg, Kleine Schriften, I, p. 6; Renou, in J.A. 241, p. 178.

[11] Gonda, in Vishv. Ind. J. 3, p. 163 ff.

[12] Hj. Frisk, Suffixales *-th-*, Göteborg 1936, p. 14 f.

[13] See e.g. Nirukta 9, 37; H. Sköld, The Nirukta, Lund 1926, p. 215.

[14] Sköld, o.c., p. 244.

(am)bā- "mother" and *bala-* "strength" or a derivative of *bhṛ-* "to bear, bring up" or even a negation of *bala-* "strength" with the negative prefix placed in the middle![1]

A one-sidedly etymological method is, on the other hand, apt to over-estimate the value of cognate words current among men of different traditions and mental attitude or of the hypothetical meaning assumed to have been usual in prehistoric times. Too often (prehistoric) etymologies—which, however evident, always are of a hypothetical character—were put on a par with well-established facts.[2] Even in those—fortunately enough frequent—cases in which only one etymological connection is possible there often remains some uncertainty on the semantic side. Every ambiguity or obscurity is an added risk of building one's arguments on quicksand, a truth utterly overlooked for instance by Hertel[3] who in expounding his Arische Feuerlehre would find "fire" and "light" in many words which also, or preferably, admit of another explanation: in his eyes *antárikṣa-* "atmosphere" properly and incontestably meant "das im Zwischenraume *(antari)* Strahlende *(kṣa-)*", although two other explanations are worth considering.

Hence many occasions for disagreeing. The words *sūnára-* —which occurs almost exclusively in the Ṛgveda— and *sūnṛ́tā-*, sometimes explained as derivatives of **sunar-*,[4] but mostly as compounds *(su-* and *nara-)* "rich in, wealth of, male (children)"[5] and, hence, with semantic expansion, "any valuable gift", were after a thorough philological investigation translated by Oldenberg[6] as "liberal, liberality" ("freigebig, Freigebigkeit"), after whom were suggested a less convincing explication "(quality of a) good (being) towards men (esp. hospitable)"[7] and a somewhat one-sidedly etymological interpretation "(possessing) (virile or in any case youthful) vital strength, youthful vitality".[8] Renou returned to the idea of "don généreux",[9] on the strength of the consideration that internal semantical evidence should prevail over etymological considerations. Another source

---

[1] Sköld, o.c., p. 290.
[2] For a somewhat exaggerated evaluation of etymologies: Thieme, in Oriens, 6, p. 396 ff. For untenable etymological speculations see also the partly immature, partly antiquated thesis by J. Nowak, Die Bedeutungsentwicklung der vedischen Verba in systematischer Darstellung, (unpublished) Thesis Freiburg Br. 1924 (e.g. p. 37 *dārāḥ* "wife" because one troubles oneself *(ādriyate)* about her).
[3] J. Hertel, Beiträge zur Erklärung des Awestas und des Vedas, Leipzig 1929, p. 181.
[4] Cf. Chr. Bartholomae, in B.B. 15, p. 24.
[5] Bergaigne, Religion védique, III, p. 295.
[1] Oldenberg, in Z.D.M.G. 50, p. 433 ff.
[7] Thieme, Fremdling, p. 159.
[8] F. B. J. Kuiper, Νώροπι χαλκῷ, Amsterdam Acad. 1951.
[9] See e.g. Renou, E.V.P. III, p. 17; 37; XVI, p. 69.

of error would consist in too much confidence in the post-Vedic meaning of *sūnṛta*- "friendly, kind; joy, gladness".[1]

A word of special historical importance which being misunderstood by Sāyaṇa has long been a subject of discussion is *yakṣá*-. As a neuter term it appears already in the Ṛgveda, as a masculine, denoting divine beings representing the *yakṣa*- power-concept, in later Vedic texts. The neuter word was variously explained as "Erstaunen, Neugierde; Wunder, Zauber, Verwandlung, Wunderkur; Wundertier, Schaustück, Fest, Naturwunder wie grosse Bäume",[2] a catalogue wisely reduced to "wunderbare, geheimnisvolle (darum häufig unheimliche) Wesenheit",[3] or—less satisfactorily, because our ideas of magic and sorcery are not applicable to antiquity— "Zauberding, Zauberwesen; übernatürliches Wesen".[4] Attempting, in a prolonged series of publications (between $\pm$ 1925—1935) to reinterpret the Vedic and ancient Iranian religions in the light of the hypothesis of a fire doctrine—which, however ingenious, was inadequately founded on fact and in spite of many valuable remarks on details strained the sense of many passages beyond discussibility—Hertel (1872—1955),[5] followed by some other scholars,[6] improbably explained the word as "light" or "fire", the idea of "a sudden flash of light" developing into a "mystery" or "magic power" and this into "wondrous being".[7] After an abortive attempt to explain the terms etymologically as Indo-European (: the root *$i̯ek$- "to speak solemnly")[8] the view that the cult of the yakṣas as well as their name were both inherited from the pre-Aryan substratum, i.e. from pre-Vedic cult,[9] was almost generally accepted with approval. This view does not however exclude the probability of relationship with the verb *pra-yakṣati* which, though formerly translated by "to hasten forward, pursue etc.", may now, on the strength of an Iranian word group of unquestionable meaning, viz. "to appear",[10] be taken in that sense. Since there does not appear any sound reason for dissociating this verb from the noun *yakṣa*-,[11] the basic meaning of the latter was assumed to have been

---

[1] Cf. e.g. Sāyaṇa, on ṚV. 1, 40, 3; 1, 134, 1. Hence Monier-Williams' translations of the Vedic words.

[2] Geldner, Vedische Studien, III, p. 143.

[3] Oldenberg, Noten, II, p. 44, following A. M. Boyer, J.A. 1906, I, p. 393 ff.: "apparition ou forme merveilleuse, merveille".

[4] A. Hillebrandt, in Festgabe-R. v. Garbe, 1927, p. 17.

[5] J. Hertel, Die arische Feuerlehre, Leipzig 1925, p. 24 ff.

[6] Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, II, p. 291.

[7] O. H. de A. Wijesekara, in University of Ceylon Review, 1, Colombo 1943.

[8] F. Sommer, in Wörter und Sachen, 7, p. 102 ff.

[9] A. K. Coomaraswamy, Yakṣas, Washington 1928, 1931. An Indian scholar (see Dandekar, Bibliography, I, p. 134 f.) insisted that this substratum was Dravidian.

[10] See H. W. Bailey, in I.I.J. 2, p. 152 ff. and in T.P.S. 1960, p. 72.

[11] With Pokorny, Wörterbuch, p. 502; cf. Uhlenbeck, Wörterbuch, p. 234 (vielleicht zu

"apparition" which "from the contexts might tend to 'monstrous'",[1] or to express this conclusion in an emended form: *yakṣa-* is an Aryan word for "a (personal or impersonal) appearance of a superhuman power (originating as a rule in pre-Aryan milieus)". This explanation seems to be in tune with the fact that these very popular genii were at an early date often visibly represented.[2]

In case it is difficult definitely to settle the meaning of a word the—in itself not new—method recently applied[3] to the evasive[4] root *vī-* translated by "to go, seak eagerly etc." may—if the word under discussion is not too rare—at least confine the possibilities within narrow contour lines: one studies as exactly as possible all the contexts and constructions in which the word occurs without ascribing to it any definite meaning; this being done one tries to find a (general, it is true) idea which could suit all relevant passages. As to *vī-* the conclusion was: a translation "to have in view, to aim at" ("sein Augenmerk richten auf") seems to be central; positively this admits of the translation "to turn to, apply oneself to", negatively "to hunt, pursue etc." Another method applied in investigating the sense of a Sanskrit word consists in hypothetically identifying this sense with, or comparing it to, the well-established sense of another word which occurs in the same or similar contexts. However, this procedure which is not likely to lead to very exact results, risks going astray, because, if no other way is open to define the meaning more exactly, it may often offer us a wide choice of significations. It was therefore rightly observed that this method[5] is especially dangerous if it is applied, not to a single word, but to a phrase.[6]

Those who would embark upon an investigation on more or less traditional lines could find free scope for collecting and cautiously explaining material in illustration of various phenomena classified under the headings descriptive and historical semantics. Systematic studies could for instance be made of such changes of meanings as that of *rátna-* which in the Veda means "wealth, gift" and later "jewel, gem"; of *khād-* which in the older

---

yákṣati).
   [1] Bailey, in I.I.J. 2, p. 154.
   [2] It may be added that Indian commentators associated the verb *yakṣ-* with *yaj-* "to worship", an untenable view pronounced again by Thumb-Hauschild, l.c. For another view see Renou, E.V.P. II, p. 28 and J. Manessy-Guitton, Recherches sur les dérivés nominaux à basis sigmatiques, Dakar 1963, p. 43 f.
   [3] W. P. Schmid, Mélanges-L. Renou, Paris 1968, p. 613.
   [4] Renou, E.V.P. IV, p. 27.
   [5] applied e.g. by Pischel, Vedische Studien, I, p. 45 ff. and A. Venkatasubbiah, Vedic studies, II, Madras 1968.
   [6] Lüders, Philologica Indica, Göttingen 1940, p. 765.

prose texts stands for "to chew" and later developed the sense of "to eat";[1] of the cases of e.g. metonymy or 'metonymic relationship' such as *vakṣas*- "breast": *vakṣáṇā*- "stomach, breast, udder", etc. etc.; of parallel forms such as *irajyáti* "(to stretch oneself, one's influence, over >) to order, lead" beside *rájati* "to act as a king".[2] The semantic peculiarities of morphologically characterized word groups are a gratifying object for investigation. There is, for instance, a marked tendency to express by means of the privative prefix not only contradiction, but also contrariety: *á-hiṃsā*- is "harmlessness, non-violence" and "sympathy".[3] Cases are not rare in which the older texts use a simple verb whereas the later language prefers a compound,[4] e.g. *baliṃ harati* "to offer a bali offering": *baliṃ upaharati*; *nṛśaṃsa*- "injuring men, mischievous" may be connected with *śaṃsa*- in the sense of "blame, imprecation", cf. *abhi-śasti*- "curse, imprecation", *abhi-śaṃs*- "to blame": the root *śaṃs*- usually, though inadequately, rendered "to praise" is in point of fact ambiguous, a so-called *vox media*.[5] An attractive field of research concerns the development of words and meanings used in mantras by what has been called[6] an internal process of expansion: passing from one formula to another they may suffer semantic modifications.

Regrettably enough, rare or obscure words, whether they had the attention of indigenous authorities or not, have often been objects of unfounded, though sometimes ingenious speculations.[7] Some of them give rise to much diversity of opinion: *akrá*- (e.g. ṚV. 1,143,7) was translated "quick; banner, horse, elephant, pillar etc.".[8] In other cases a more or less traditional interpretation retained under the influence of an incorrect etymology may be improved upon so that another etymological connection gains in probability: *aktú*- explained by Grassmann as "das sternengezierte Dunkel des Nachthimmels (*añj*- "to anoint")" rather means "the last part of the night"[9] (cf. Gothic *ūhtwo* "dawn"). Hapax

---

[1] H. Oertel, in A. C. Woolner Commemoration volume, 1940, p. 177 ff.

[2] Renou, E.V.P. VII, p. 31; XIV, p. 99.

[3] Gonda, Four studies, ch. III.

[4] Gonda, in A.O. 20, p. 167 ff.

[5] Renou, J.A. 231, p. 177 f. where also other instances of so-called *voces mediae* (antonymous senses attached to the same word).

[6] Renou, in Vāk, 5, p. 118 ff.

[7] See e.g. V. M. Apte's explanation of *śvaghnín*- ("désignation sans doute populaire du joueur heureux", Renou, E.V.P. III, p. 40) in A.B.O.R.I. 31, p. 165 ff.: "the gambler who by a particular ceremony kills the 'dog' i.e. the demon of epilepsy"; less improbably N. Sen, in J.O.I.B. 1, p. 369: "one who in gambling kills (avoids) an unlucky throw (called "the dog")".

[8] Another instance is *aratí*- which was tentatively translated by "servant", "mediator", "spokes (of a wheel)".

[9] S. D. Atkins, in J.A.O.S. 70, p. 38 ff.

legomena or very rare words of uncertain meaning often made an appeal to the ingenuity of philological rope-walkers: *héṣasvant-* in RV. 6,3,3 was successively translated by "armed", "wounded", "cracking" ("sounding", Sāyaṇa), "glowing", "hasty", the first guess being sometimes held to be the probable one;[1] with regard to *ukhachíd-*[2] (RV. 4,19,9) scholars waver between "breaking a pot", "fragile as a pot" and, what seems least improbable, "the one who has broken (a particular part of) his upper leg"; how are we to know for certain that the hapax *vánas-* corresponds, as often has been supposed, exactly to Lat. *Venus*?; is *vápsas-* related to *vápus-* "wonderful (appearance)" or to *vapati* "to scatter, sow"?[3] The compound *śakadhūma-* literally "dung-smoke" (said to be the king of the constellations: AV. 6,128,1) was variously interpreted ("fire before the break of dawn", "lump of cow-dung containing smoke" (then I would prefer "containing the steam which arises from freshly dropped cow-pats"), "weather-prophet", "Pleiades").[4] Sometimes the problem of the exact meaning of a word cannot be disconnected from the question as to its etymological identity with an Iranian word: *drapsá-:* Av. *drafšō* "banner".[5]

One may, however, combat also ghost-roots or ghost-etymologies.[6] Joining Pāṇini[7] and other Indian authorities Grassmann, Whitney[8] and most other scholars distinguish two separate roots, *idh-* "to kindle" and *edh-* "to thrive", without agreeing, however, on the origin of the latter.[9] Although *idh-* and *edh-* were, already in Pāṇini's times, sufficiently different to make the grammarians regard them as unrelated, a recent argument in favour of their original identity:[10] *idh-* "to glow": *edh-* "to glow, be radiant (of healthy, wealthy etc. people)" deserves attention. Sometimes indeed scholars were fully justified in denying the existence of a word assumed, on insufficient grounds, by their colleagues:[11] *bhreṣate* translated by "to

---

[1] Lüders, in A.O. 13, p. 123 f. (= Philologica Indica, p. 781 f.)

[2] See e.g. Windisch, in Festgruss-Boehtlingk, Stuttgart 1888, p. 114 ff.; M. Bloomfield, in A.J.P. 38, p. 13; Neisser, o.c., I, p. 170.

[3] See e.g. also Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, s.v. *asúrta-; céru-; galuntá-; nihā́kā-; paladá-; bhárūji-; maderú-; máhikeru-; muhuká-.*

[4] J. Charpentier, in B.S.O.S. 8 (1935-37), p. 449 ff.

[5] For an intricate semantic and etymological problem see e.g. also Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, s.v. *prásti-.*

[6] Corrupted forms and 'monstres linguistiques' are left out of consideration.

[7] Pāṇini 6, 1, 89; 215.

[8] Whitney, Roots, p. 16.

[9] H. Berger, in M.I.S. 1 (1955), p. 48 f. proposed to explain *edh-* as borrowed from a vernacular in which *ṛdh-* "to prosper" becoming *idh-* had analogically given rise to a secondary strong root form *edh-*.

[10] Thieme, in I.L. 1958 (Turner Jub. Vol. I), p. 149 ff.

[11] See e.g. Oldenberg, in Z.D.M.G. 50 (1896), p. 423 ff. (= K.S. p. 1 ff.) on *váhni-* "exalted" etc. (Neisser, in B.B. 18, p. 301 ff.).

totter, waver"[1] really is a subjunctive of the aorist of *bhrī-* "to injure, hurt"[2] the family of which (*bhréṣa-* "damage, injury") is dying out in Old Indian; under the other ghost-words which were shown up was also the verb *path-* assumed to mean "to move" or "to fly".[3]

Inadequate translations are on the other hand not always replaced by better interpretations as soon as these have been proposed. The conservative authority of the dictionaries and an oversight of the relative literature on the part of an author not rarely co-operate in preserving antiquated explanations.[4]

The above remarks should not have us believe that a searching examination of the pertinent texts—if these are sufficient—will always settle the problem. Sometimes research is hampered by the errors of our predecessors which like ghosts may walk through new pieces of research. Thus a recent treatise of the word *aghnyā-*[5] about the meaning and etymology of which there can be no doubt ("cow", lit. "which should not be killed") joins many preceding comments[6] in overlooking that the practice of cow-slaughter was not necessarily incompatible with an idealistic view of bovine life fostered in those prehistoric circles which gave rise to this expression. That a fresh semantic investigation may result in a higher degree of incertitude than was supposed to exist beforehand appears from a study of some words for parts of a chariot.[7]

Irregular or semantically obscure forms were also in Old Indian replaced by new forms of more normal structure and intelligible semantic content, although the latter were apt to be overdone: the oldest form for "spider" is in all probability *ūrṇa-vábhi-* "the she-weaver of wool"; when however the second member of this compound became unintelligible—the root *vabh-* had fallen into disuse—it was replaced by *nábhi-* "navel", the name of the spider becoming *ūrṇanābha-* "having wool on the navel" and hence *tantunābha-* "emitting threads from its navel".[8]

A good instance of a time-honoured explanation becoming questionable

---

[1] Petr. Dict., V, 414; Monier-Williams, etc.
[2] K. Hoffmann, in Festschrift-W. Schubring, Hamburg 1951, p. 19 ff.
[3] Hoffmann, in K.Z. 79, p. 180 ff.
[4] Thus P. Horsch, Die vedische Gāthā- und Śloka-Literatur, Bern 1966, p. 147, while quoting the in itself correct explanation of *iṣṭāpūrta-* ("what has been sacrificed to the gods and presented to the priests") by E. Windisch, in Festschrift-Böhtlingk, Stuttgart 1888, p. 115 ff., failed to notice what has been written on this compound afterwards (see Gonda, The Savayajñas, Amsterdam Acad. 1965, p. 236 f.: "ritual merit").
[5] H. P. Schmidt, in K.Z. 78, p. 1 ff.; cf. J. Narten, in Proc. Congres Oosters Gen. in Nederland 1970.
[6] From Chr. Lassen (1847) onwards.
[7] J. Manessy-Guitton, Védique *pradhi-*, *upadhi-*, *pratidhi-*, *pavi-*, in Orbis 14 (1965), p. 386 ff.
[8] A. Debrunner, in Festschrift-F. Sommer, Wiesbaden 1955, p. 20 ff.

by a fresh light thrown upon the concept denoted is *ananga-* which, also as one of the names of Kāma, the Indian Amor, was interpreted as "(the) Bodyless (one)" because according to the well-known mythical tale the god Śiva reduced him to ashes. Since there is some probability that a divine representative of sexual love was named after sexual acts etc., the term might however be rather explained as an intensive noun belonging to the root *añj-* "to anoint" ("energetically or repeatedly anointing"), *añji-* occurring to denote the male sexual organ.[1] Then the mythical tale does not prove anything more than that the poetical tradition understood, or chose to understood, the name no longer in its original sense. With this in itself probable etymology one of the explanations given of another name of the same god, viz. *Manmatha* (as "the one who (sexually) churns"), would be in perfect harmony.[2]

The results reached, in the course of the XXth century, by new methods applied for instance to the study of local differentiations in a speech-area (so-called dialect geography) and to the allied detailed investigations into the history of single words or of formally or semantically related word groups provided an incentive to an examination of the Old Indian homonyms.[3] It appeared that homonymy must in that ancient period have led to troubles of communication similar to those which we know to have resulted, in living languages, in disuse or change of particular forms. Of Vedic *dhánus-* and *dhánvan-* "bow"[4] the former, and of *dhánu-* and *dhánvan-* "dry soil" only the latter form was practically to survive and *pāyú-* "protector" may with greater probability have become obsolete because of *pāyú-* "anus"; beside *véda-* "knowledge", *veda-* "property" had unlike *vedá-* "bunch of grass made into a broom" no future. The forms deriving from homonymous roots are very often not identical: thus *ni-drā-ti* "he falls asleep", but the reduplicative *dári-drā-ti* "he runs hither and thither". The verbal adjective *hitá-* "impelled, sent" *(hi-)* occurs a few times in the older Veda to be replaced by *prá-hita-*; *híta-* belongs to *dhā-* "to place, set" which did hardly produce compounds with *pra-*. The remarkable productivity of verbal adjectives in *-ná-* was no doubt largely conditioned by the same tendency: *vṛkṇá-* belongs to *vrasc-* "to cleave", *vṛṣṭá-* to *vṛṣ-* "to rain", *vṛk-tá-* to *vṛj-* "to bend, twist", *vraj-itá-* to *vraj-* "to go".

Sometimes two homonymous words were distinguished where in fact there is only one. Thus the Petersburg Dictionary[5] makes mention of *máhas-*

[1] S. Konow, in Festschrift-J. Wackernagel, Göttingen 1924, p. 1 ff.
[2] Cf. Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, II, p. 583.
[3] Gonda, in A.O. 14, p. 161 ff. (See also K. Kunjunni Raja, in A.L.B. 19, p. 193 ff.).
[4] Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, III, p. 318.
[5] Petr. Dict. V, 615 f.

"joy" and "festival, sacrifice" beside *máhas-* "greatness, magnificence", but nowadays we may be sure the opposite view is right:[1] this noun expresses various contextual modifications of the idea "greatness"—*inter alia* "majesty", "distinction", "exaltation", "a subjective feeling of superiority and cheerfulness", "celebration"—the related verb *maháyati* means "he magnifies, extols, glorifies" ("makes great by means of eulogies" etc.), *mahīyáte* "he is (feels) great, superior, prospers, is exalted". In proposing to reduce a traditional pair of homonyms to a single word one should however carefully study all text-places available, a requirement which a monograph on the term *dhāsí-*[2]—according to the Petersburg Dictionary, Grassmann[3] and others[4] there exist: I *dhāsí-* f. "dwelling-place" and II *dhāsí-* m. "milk-beverage"—fails to comply with so that the author's rendering "source" is[5], intelligibly enough, open to serious criticism, alternative solutions ("was in ein Behältnis hineingesetzt ist, Sitz; Speise usw." or "treasure, wealth" *dhā-*), suggested by his critics,[6] being however not completely conclusive. The double use of *añc-* (and its compounds), viz. "to bend" and "to draw (water)" was explained from the necessity of diverting the course of the water in (or, from?) a spring.[7]

In other cases arguments were adduced to show that we have to do with two words, not with polysemy. The noun *rájas-*, translated by "coloured or dim space, the sphere of vapour or mist, atmosphere, air, firmament; vapour, gloom; impurity" (Monier-Williams, following the Petersburg Dictionary), or "dunkler Raum, Luftraum" (Grassmann) was long tacitly considered a case of polysemy until it was on the basis of a renewed examination of the texts argued[8] that there really are two words, viz. *rájas-* "space, extent, expanse" (belonging to the root *raj-*, I.E. *reĝ-* "to stretch out") and *rájas-* "dirt, dust" (a cognate of Gothic *riqis* "darkness").[9] Nowadays *usrá-* "matutinal" and "dawn-coloured" and *usrá-* "bull" are considered different words, the animal being no longer believed to bear the name of the "red one".

---

[1] Gonda, in J.O.I.B. 8 (1958), p. 234.
[2] K. L. Janert, Sinn und Bedeutung des Wortes *dhāsi*, Wiesbaden 1956.
[3] Grassmann, Wörterbuch, 681.
[4] Among whom is also H. Berger, in Z.D.M.G. 108, p. 413 ff.
[5] Notwithstanding Renou's approval (J.A. 244, p. 321 f.).
[6] B. Schlerath, in Oriens, 10, p. 190 ff. (cf. also Renou, E.V.P. IV, p. 29; 55); S. Michalski, in R.O. 25 (1961), p. 7 ff. and see Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, II, p. 102.
[7] K. Hoffmann, in K.Z. 79, p. 171 ff. For an unconvincing attempt to distinguish three roots *man-*: B. R. Sharma, in B.D.C.R.I. 25 (1966), p. 135 ff.
[8] Burrow, in B.S.O.A.S. 12, p. 645 ff. However, Bailey, in T.P.S. 1960, p. 76 returns to "dark space", and compare also J. A. Santucci, Vedic *ṛj-* and *rāj-*, (unpublished) thesis Canberra 1970, p. 181 ff.
[9] Otherwise but improbably: Burrow, o.c., p. 650 f.

A study of the verb *heṣ-* "to neigh" led its author,[1] not only to improve upon translations and interpretations proposed by his predecessors, but also to a delimitation of the forms of this root and other word families, to a better understanding of words occurring together with *heṣant-* etc.,[2] and to a deeper insight into the signification of neighing in ancient popular belief.

Awaking to the insight that also in an ancient language real synonyms must have been an extremely rare occurrence a few scholars embarked upon an investigation into the semantic differences of words which are commonly but incorrectly regarded as such. Thus studies were made of words belonging to the important fields of speech, inspiration, production of poetry and producers of sacral texts by which interesting differences, special uses etc. were brought to light.[3] Grassmann[4] was no doubt right in indicating, contrary to the Petersburg Dictionary, a meaning "undivided, whole, uninjured, complete" prevailing in the Ṛgveda for *sárva-*, the adjective *víśva-* "(all,) every" which on the face of it seems synonymous, expressing the idea of "all" only seldom to concur with *sárva-* in the younger parts of that corpus. Much later a closer investigation into the meaning of the former adjective[5] and its family—to which belong also Lat. *salvus* "well-preserved, whole, sound, safe" and *salus* "health, welfare, safety" and Gr. ὅλος "complete in all its parts"—confirming this view revealed not only its frequent use in combination with words denoting some aspect of totality etc. but also the implications of expressions such as *sarvajña-* which, though traditionally translated by "omniscient", rather refers to one who "has gained an insight into the nature of the totality".

Though not pretending to be a linguistic investigation, some remarks made on the 'articulation' of ancient Indian nobility[6] did not fail to shed light on the content of relative terminology. A thorough examination of semantically related terms proves indeed to be very fruitful. Whereas, for instance, lexicographers are inclined to give "earth" as the first translation of *bhū-, bhūman-, bhūmi-, pṛthivī-, medinī-*, a closer investigation of the text places reveals interesting differences, the soil being distinguished from the broad space to live in etc.[7] *Bhúvana-* indicating the whole ag-

---

[1] Lüders, in A.O. 13, p. 81 ff. (= Philologica Indica, p. 751 ff.).

[2] Compare however also Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, I, p. 328 s.v. *gárdā-* and II, p. 341 s.v. *pēruḥ*.

[3] Renou, Les pouvoirs de la parole dans le Ṛgveda, E.V.P. 1, p. 1 ff.; Gonda, The vision of the Vedic poets, The Hague 1963.

[4] Grassmann, Wörterbuch, 1489.

[5] Gonda, in I.L. 16 (1955), p. 53 ff.

[6] W. Rau, Staat und Gesellschaft im alten Indien, Wiesbaden 1957, p. 67 ff.

[7] G. Tucci, in Eranos-Jahrbuch, 22, p. 323 ff.

gregate of what has come, and is coming, into being is, in the Veda, widely distinct from *loka-* "a place of rest and safety in universal extensity, a recognized position to which man aspires (e.g. by ritual means) and in which he comes into contact with power"[1], although both words are translated by "world". The sense of words such as *śulká-*, translated by "price, purchase-money", and *krayá-* "purchase" could be stated more exactly,[2] the former being probably tinged by its application to customs and taxes, the latter denoting a purchase characterized by due observance of forms and custom.

Studies of this type were, at least in part, intended to argue in favour of an adapted application of the theory of 'semantic fields' to the examination of the Old Indian vocabulary. There is indeed no reason not to suppose that the Vedic corpus will show us in many respects pictures of closely knit and articulated lexical spheres in which the significance of each unit is determined by its neighbours so that the semantic areas reciprocally limit each other, and while covering the whole sphere divide it up between them. A thorough investigation of the 'semantic fields'—organically articulated sections of the general vocabulary—will no doubt deepen our insight into the relations between language and thought, and help us to detect—as far as possible—the values and distinctions enshrined in the medium constituted by the language, that is to reconstruct the general framework of thought imposed by that typically articulated framework upon Indian man. It may be recalled that even in those cases in which some words deriving from the same root are semantically hardly distinct from one another, their stylistic or formular value may be worth examining very closely.[3]

Some approach to a 'field study' is also F. Sommer's short discussion of *vehát-*[4] "a barren cow" (not "a cow that miscarries") in which the use of the word is examined in relation to other words for the various stages between infertility and normal fertility of cows etc.

Another approach to the semantic exploration of a body of literature consists in the study of concepts, while differentiating the ranges of applicability of the aspects of these concepts. Oldenberg devoted an interesting article to the words for "beauty" and "beautiful"—*śrī-*, *lakṣmī-*, *bhadrá-*, *cáru-*, *śubh-*, *vápus-*, *valgú-* etc.[5]—which, emphasizing the aesthetic aspects of these words too one-sidedly, could, now we know that the

---

[1] Gonda, in Vishv. Ind. J. 5, p. 42 ff.; the same, Loka, Amsterdam Acad. 1966.
[2] Gonda, in L. Sarup Memorial Vol., Hoshiarpur 1954, p. 231 ff.
[3] Renou, Les noms pour 'don' dans le Ṛgveda, in B.S.O.A.S. 20, p. 471 ff.
[4] F. Sommer, in M.S.S. 11, p. 5 ff.
[5] Oldenberg, in N.G. 1918, p. 35 ff. (= K.S., p. 830 ff.).

aesthetic, the social and the religious were no separate provinces of culture, be revised. The primary sense of *śrī-* was no doubt something like "prosperity, well-being" rather than "beauty".[1] The presence or absence of heat in many situations being a matter of profound significance to Vedic man, a monograph on the expressions of this concept in the Ṛgveda and Atharvaveda[2] presenting the relevant material in chapters on "heat and enemies", "heat of the body", "heat and the cosmos" etc., was therefore, notwithstanding serious shortcomings—the author missed almost all opportunities to connect semantics with the cultural background —a welcome contribution to our understanding of an important complex of ideas, denoted by derivatives of the root *tap-* and some other words.

Although in view of the present state of research we should beware of extravagant conclusions and although on the other hand philosophers are apt to overlook the limitations of the linguistic possibilities, definite semantic (and morphological) facts are worth studying from the point of view of the history of Indian thought.[3] The absence of derivatives of *as-* "to be" contrasts with the wealth of forms belonging to *bhū-* "to become", which is also used to indicate that which recurs regularly or in certain conditions.[4]

Up to the present day most semantic studies have however limited themselves to isolated words, especially to such words as are of interest for a right understanding of ancient Indian thought, and attacked the relevant problems so as to delimit the meaning of a word more precisely and to comprehend the idea expressed more thoroughly. It is clear that the meaning of very common and frequent terms is often determined by the view of life and the ideas of cosmos and human society of those who used them: words for "gift, giving etc." should for instance be understood against the background of the conviction that the one—be he a man or a god—who has gained wealth must give away part of it to his dependents, and of the belief that a gift is or establishes a bond between giver and recipient; that the latter derives part of the essence or potency of the former; that a gift produces rich returns for the giver.[5] The word *rāti-*,

---

[1] Gonda, Aspects of early Viṣṇuism, p. 176 ff., esp. p. 204. For other criticism see e.g. Neisser, o.c., I, p. 67 ff.

[2] C. J. Blair, Heat in the Rig Veda and Atharva Veda, New Haven 1961.

[3] See e.g. the somewhat subjective book by B. Heimann, Indian and western philosophy, London 1937.

[4] P. Masson-Oursel, Journal de psychologie, Paris 1930, p. 259 ff.; see also H. Hendriksen, in A.O. 20, p. 206 ff.

[5] H. Günther, in K.Z. 69, p. 225 ff. (part of the author's views, e.g. those with regard to a primitive identity of subject and object, are open to question); Gonda, in Vishv. Ind. J. 2 (1964), p. 9 ff.; J. C. Heesterman, in I.I.J. 3, p. 241 ff. (in connection with the *dakṣiṇā*, which should not be translated by "fee" or "salary"); Renou (see p. 178, n. 3).

which for the sake of brevity may be translated by "gift", implies the so-called primitive energetics in general, that is health, physical power, fertility, food, esteem, prestige etc.; a plausible inference is therefore that the root *rā-* "to give" also referred to a transmission of power or energy in general. The impossibility of translating a term such as *bhagavat-* —"blessed", "holy", "glorious", "adorable" etc.—led to a discussion,[1] but not to a communis opinio.

The meaning of the root noun *iṣ-*, normally interpreted by Sāyaṇa as referring to "food" and hence in modern times usually rendered by "nourishment" and the like—an interpretation which seems to suit some passages very well—was shown to be wider, viz. "thriving, flourishing, prospering, prosperity, wealth". This central idea may apply, not only to that thriving which results from adequate nourishment, to that nourishment itself, to the force inherent in, or even to the fructifying influence of, water, but also to men's thriving in material, economic, or social position.[2] When the Vedic poets prayed for *iṣ-* they included under this term much more than mere nourishment, and the latter 'meaning' may even be considered a contextual specialization. From the above it follows that there was (also in derivatives) a root *iṣ-* "to prosper flourish", which, though not recognized in the dictionaries, is distinct from *iṣ-* "to send" and *iṣ-* "to wish".

Even usual translations of quite common words may create misunderstanding. In rendering *rājan-* by "king" one should avoid, not only associations with constitutional government, but also other aspects of hereditary leadership: any nobleman or prince could be called a *rājan-*, but the ruling *rājan-* was not only a political but also a religious figure, a consecrated mediator believed to extend blessings and protection over his country and subjects; hence also epithets and titles such as *nṛ-pātṛ-* "protector of men" etc.:[3] needless to emphasize the importance of a systematic study of epithets and other qualifications.[4]

In consideration of the fact that ornaments worn on the body etc. are widely valued also as amulets or talismans, translations such as "ornament" for *alaṃkāra-* turn out to be one-sided; meaning etymologically "making fit,—sufficient,—suited for, imparting to somebody (something) sufficient strength for", this term properly denoted a magico-religious expedient

---

[1] Cf. E. W. Hopkins, in J.R.A.S. 1911, p. 727 ff.
[2] Cf. Burrow, in B.S.O.A.S. 17 (1955), p. 326 ff.
[3] J. Gonda, Ancient Indian kingship, in Numen, 3 and 4 (Leiden 1956-57), also separately, Leiden 1966; J. C. Heesterman, The ancient Indian royal consecration, Thesis Utrecht 1957; Rau, o.c., p. 68 ff.
[4] Gonda, Epithets in the Ṛgveda, The Hague 1959.

ritually to fortify the wearer, to put him in a sacred state or to counteract injurious influences; the related adjective *araṃkṛta-* means "made fit (for ritual purposes)".[1] These considerations may also explain the noun *bhūṣaṇa-* "ornament" which no doubt belongs to the verb *bhūṣati* and leads us to improve upon the semantic explication of the secondary root *bhūṣ-:* not "to be busy for, be intent upon", but "to cause to develop or prosper, to strengthen" (*bhū-* "to grow, become" and a 'causative' *s*).[2]

The term *bandhu-* which is of special frequency in ritualistic contexts can be quoted to show that in tackling semantic puzzles continued endeavour may be crowned with success. After some interpretations which were probably suggested by the time-honoured but untenable semantic 'rule' that 'abstract' notions generally derive from 'concrete' significations the sense "kinsman" or even the possibility of a sense "umbilical cord" were considered to explain its technical use "connection".[3] After prolonged hesitation between "connection of the ritual texts and formulas with the sacrificial acts" (Weber, 1852), "secret effects of the ritual" (Oldenberg, 1919), "explicative identification" (Renou, 1949)[4] or "symbolical connection" (the same) etc.—each author forming an idea of the *bandhu-* concept within the framework of his own interpretation of the view of the world and life of the ritualists—the latest proposal is (briefly formulated) "metaphysical connections between the ritual acts, their relations with the unseen powers and their effects". The noun *satya-*, usually rendered by "true" or "truth", but also translatable by "real, essential", etc., derives from *sat-*, the present participle of *as-* "to be", which not only means "being", but also "real, actual, reality, the really existent cosmos etc.".[5] The negative *a-sat-* answers to "chaos" rather than "(absolute) non-being". A comparable term is the archaic *ábhva-* denoting not ideas such as "immense" or "monstrous" (Monier-Williams) but rather a principle of evil, the opposite of light, literally "that which is not subject to becoming (*bhū-*)".[6]

Thus the magico-religious or ritualistic sphere in which the majority of the texts has been composed necessitates our being prepared for special connotations. Thus the adjective *guru-* "heavy" has been shown to express, for instance in connection with *mantra-* "sacred formula", the

---

[1] Gonda, in New Indian Antiquary, 1, p. 97 ff.; cf. also ibidem, 2, p. 69 f.

[2] Gonda, Four studies, ch. II.

[3] Cf. S. Schayer, in Zs. f. Buddhismus, 6 (1925), p. 276 f.; Renou, in J.A. 241 (1953), p. 171.

[4] For particulars see Gonda, in A.L.B. 29 (1965), p. 1 ff.

[5] Gonda, in A.B.O.R.I. 48-49 (1968), p. 83 ff. (with bibliographical notes).

[6] Renou, in J.A. 241, p. 167 ff.

nuance: "uncommonly loaded with power".[1]—The use of, for instance, the word *náva-* and its relatives was for religious reasons suggestive of the much desired periodical renewal.[2]—The Ṛgvedic phrase *śávasa utsavá-* "the generating of a particular form of power called *śávas*" may furnish us the clue to the understanding of the (later) word *utsava-* "festival".[3]— The implications of words for "remnant, rest, leavings" are too manifold to allow of a short reference.[4]—In a variety of contexts the term *pratiṣṭhā-* "basis, support" expresses the deep concern of the Indians about a firm and ultimate ground to rest upon, an immovable and imperishable support of existence, for sky and earth, for themselves, for the universe.[5]— There has been a prolonged discussion of the terms *prāṇa-* and *apāna-* which were long ago shown to mean "expiration" and "inspiration":[6] the ancient Indians had peculiar conceptions of the process and function of breathing and so these translations are not complete, the *apāna-* being also thought to promote digestion.

It is not surprising that there existed also verbal prohibitions, symptomatic of the close links between names and the powers or concepts they stand for. There was for instance a tendency to avoid words denoting downright emptiness, because, in contradistinction to fullness, this idea is inauspicious;[7] the word *tucchyá-* "empty" is therefore in the Ṛgveda only used when it will do no harm or when the harm is intended, the word *riktá-*, literally "left (behind)", being a favourite substitute.[8]

A special difficulty resides in the relation between the 'profane' use of many words in ancient Indian life and their specialized application in the religious and ritual milieus which left us their texts. Was for instance *kratu-* 'originally' a term of war and sportmanship which afforded excellent opportunities to exhibit the qualities indicated by that word?:[9] the god Agni is said to be a good shot by his *kratu-* and in connection with chariot races the term does not only refer to the winning power inherent in horses and drivers but also to the victory itself and the ability to carry the day. Was then this word afterwards borrowed by the priests and trans-

---

[1] Gonda, in B.S.O.A.S. 12, p. 124 ff.

[2] Gonda, in W.Z.K.M. 48, p. 275 ff.

[3] Gonda, in India antiqua (Volume presented to J. Ph. Vogel), Leiden 1947, p. 146 ff.

[4] Gonda, in Mélanges-Renou, Paris 1968, p. 301 ff.

[5] Gonda, in Studia indologica internationalia, I, Poona-Paris 1954 (only offprints published).

[6] W. Caland, in Z.D.M.G. 55, p. 261; 56, p. 556 and (dispelling doubts of other scholars) P. E. Dumont, in J.A.O.S. 77, p. 46 f.

[7] H. Günther, in K.Z. 68 (1944), p. 129 ff. and in P.A.I.O.C., 16 (1955), p. 251 ff.

[8] For euphemism: J. Huizinga, in Album-H. Kern, Leiden 1903, p. 153.

[9] K. Rönnow, in M.O. 26-27 (1932-33), p. 1 ff.; see especially p. 14 f.; 17; 20; 40; 72; 74 f.

ferred to the holy power, holy work or holiness of the priests?[1] Since however the gods are born together with this *kratu-*[2] and are implored to grant it to men,[3] and very often the meaning "inventiveness, resourcefulness" seems to suit the context best,[4] the question arises whether the idea of physical ability really was so 'original' or central and whether "resourcefulness" is not at the base of all contextual senses, the meaning "sacrificial rite" representing a concretization or special manifestation of that idea.[5]

Thieme[6] and Renou[7] disagreed with regard to the application of a principle adopted by the latter to establish, wherever possible, the 'initial meaning' of a word, an ambiguous term under which the latter understood the value opposed to those values "which are just underlying and figurative". We must guard against a confusion of ideas: the etymologically 'initial sense', which as all meaning is intrinsically vague, is not necessarily identical with the most frequent or central sense occurring at a given period in a definite body of literature. The search for an initial sense, moreover, is apt to make us overestimate the import of a statistically frequent contextual use or of an 'etymological sense'[8]—the hypothetical nature of which is not always sufficiently realized—which may expose us to the risk of introducing semantic nuances which are more or less exclusively proper to the etymologically cognate words in other languages and cause us to forget that the words belonging, in a definite culture, to the same semantic field, are organized or structured into a systematic whole which is subject to change. The risks minimized by Thieme in advocating the view that we must hazard a conjecture as to what might be a likely 'initial meaning' and establish the correctness of that conjecture experimentally are, first the great chance of error, especially in the cases of words of infrequent occurrence, and the liability to overlook that the way of categorizing experience by means of their vocabulary followed by the ancient Indians is far from generally corresponding to the ways of modern men in Western countries and that therefore the value of the frequent refer-

---

[1] This is Rönnow's opinion.

[2] I refer to Bergaigne, o.c., III, p. 310 ff.

[3] Neisser, o.c., II, p. 66 ff.

[4] Gonda, Vision, p. 183 f.; 261 f. Cf. also S. Venkateswaran, in Siddheshwar Varma Comm. Vol. I (1950), p. 189 ff.

[5] For the etymology see W. Havers, in Anthropos, 49, p. 201; Hj. Frisk, Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, II, Heidelberg 1961, p. 10.

[6] Thieme, in J.A.O.S. 57, p. 51 ff.

[7] Renou, E.V.P. I, p. 1 ff.

[8] Etymological considerations have, also in those frequent cases in which the etymology is a matter of dispute, played—to mention only this—too important a role in the discussion of the character of Vedic gods. See Gonda, in History of religions, 1, p. 262 ff.

ences made by the German scholar to semantic transitions and relations in Latin or German and even to the use made by individual authors as for instance Horace or Schiller cannot be conclusive,[1] i.e. more than heuristic or illustrative.

Different peoples and communities are indeed accustomed to analyze and divide up phenomenal reality in various ways with the result that in the language of one community one and the same term is used and the speakers traditionally make no distinction between different 'concepts' where others using more than one term are grown up in the belief that two terms and a distinction are quite natural. That means, in one language concepts which are elsewhere regarded as widely different may obviously be viewed as so nearly related or fundamentally identical that they are denoted by one and the same term, which according to circumstances must be translated by different words which in other languages evoke other images and other associations. Ascribing to the nouns in -tu- the function of "un nom d'action à valeur 'agissante'" and basing himself on a thorough examination of the texts relating to the functions of the Vedic officiants who are invited to act ṛtúnā, i.e., in French, "selon la répartition" Renou[2] inferred that ṛtú- —which belongs to the root ṛ- "to organize a continuum, to make it articulate"—denoted the idea of "function", more exactly "la 'fonction' distributive en vertu de laquelle officiants et dieux sont liés les uns aux autres suivant un système stable, à des fins déterminées". That means that in an enumerative and more or less 'hierarchized' series ṛtu- stands for the "facteur de répartition, l'élément qui sectionne pour ainsi dire une continuité ou la portion ainsi sectionnée". Hence ṛtu- in the sense of a "division of time" etc.

So it is not surprising that the same word, ari-, could express various nuances of the idea "stranger", for instance the stranger who is a guest or a rival or an enemy, but that this idea was, on the other hand, in all probability only applicable to a stranger with whom a member of one's own group could marry.[3]

Not rarely no adequate translation is possible even for words of frequent occurrence. The central meaning of mantra- —for which "incantation" may indeed sometimes, though far from generally, serve; "short prayer" or "mystical sound" are very incomplete; "liturgy and mystical formula" lead to misunderstanding; "hymn addressed to the gods" is incorrect—can

---

[1] As is Thieme's opinion, in Z.D.M.G. 106, p. 145 ff.
[2] Renou, in Arch. Or. 18, 1-2, p. 431 ff.
[3] See Dumézil's modification (J.A. 246, p. 47 ff.) of the thesis defended by Thieme, Fremdling.

only be paraphrased somewhat as follows: "word(s) believed to be of superhuman origin and therefore loaded with power, received, fashioned and pronounced by inspired seers or poets in order to evoke divine power(s) and stimulate its (their) activity and especially conceived as means of creating, converging, concentrating and realizing efficient thought by which to identify oneself with the essence of the divinity which is assumed to be present in the mantra".[1]

Thus many erroneous, though often convenient, translations and explanations, part of which were due to the more or less thoughtless equalization of Indian and European concepts and the use of terms hereditarily affected by typically Western tradition, were, and are, to be corrected. The idea formed by an Englishman of "immortality" is not identical with the ancient Indian *amŕta-* "that which is free from death and consists in continuance of life";[2] *ātmán-* is not our "soul", and even *devá-* "god" needs defining.[3] The predominant aspect of the term *nírŕti-* (or as a goddess, Nirŕti), "Verwesung" and "Abgrund" according to Grassmann, was shown to be that of a power or place of the destruction of a living being which was conceived as an interruption or violation of the eternal law and order called *ŕtá-*,[4] the Vedic conception of 'hell' being rather a state of chaos or disorder.[5] The *puróhita-* "domestic chaplain" did not owe his title to his being a prelate (< Lat. *praelātus*) "commissioned" or having "den Vortritt",[6] but to the fact that this brahminical functionary, by virtue of the potencies inherent in his personality and accumulated by his knowledge was "placed before" his patron in order to protect him so to say as a living shield.[7]

Many ancient Indian terms denote power-substances (in German *Daseinsmächte*),[8] potencies which were supposed to be present in persons, things and phenomena, and by virtue of which these were believed to be powerful, effective, influential, endowed with something which is beyond the bounds of normal intelligence. Thus *ójas-* may rather vaguely be described as a kind of creative and inaugurative energy proper e.g. to the great god Indra;[9] *tápas-*, usually translated by "asceticism" or "austerity",

---

[1] Gonda, in Oriens, 16, p. 244 ff.
[2] Thieme, Studien zur indogermanischen Wortkunde und Wortgeschichte, Berlin 1952, ch. II.
[3] C. W. J. van der Linden, The concept of deva in the Vedic age, Thesis Utrecht 1954.
[4] Renou, in I.L. 16, p. 11 ff.
[5] W. Norman Brown, The Rigvedic equivalent for Hell, in J.A.O.S. 61, p. 76 ff.
[6] Caland (orally), Monier-Williams, Dictionary, s.v.; Geldner, Rigveda übersetzt, I (1951), p. 481.
[7] Gonda, in Festschrift-W. Kirfel, Bonn 1955, p. 107 ff.
[8] H. von Glasenapp, Entwicklungsstufen des indischen Denkens, Halle S. 1940, p. 9 ff.
[9] Gonda, Ancient-Indian *ojas*, Utrecht 1952. For some additions see Dumézil, in Revue

may have owed its name to a creative internal glow which may be accumulated by austerities and by which one can achieve objects otherwise unattainable. Since the root *tap-* means "to be, or to make, hot" (cf. Lat. *tepidus*) this idea is to all appearance at the base of the concept, but a 'reconstruction' of a 'semantic development': "chaleur (douce) > chaleur (intense) > souffrance > macération, ascétisme",[1] can no longer be upheld. That the Indian tradition emphasizes other aspects of the *tapas* concept— e.g. "reflection, higher knowledge"[2]—than the etymological meaning, is another question. Often the 'idea', a potency and its bearers, manifestations or occasions on which it manifests itself are indiscriminately denoted by the same term. Thus *vája-*[3] does not only stand for a generative power manifesting itself in vegetation, cattle, etc., by which new food etc., new vitality is gained and which may be won by races and other sportive events, but also for the race in which it is generated, the so-called prize which is won in a *vája-* generating process, for display of *vája-* consisting in the bestowal of wealth, plenty of food etc. It is here also not recommendable to assume a chain of semantic transitions, for instance: "Siegeskraft" > "Anspannung der Siegeskraft" > "Wettkampf, Sieg" > "Siegespreis" > "Labung".[4]

The terminology of a community normally results from experience acquired in many concrete situations in which representations, localizations and manifestations are more significant than ideas and results or consequences more evident than causes. Hence indeed the tendency not to distinguish terminologically between an 'idea' and its materializations: *śrávas-* is "fame, renown" as well as "praise", "something worthy of praise," "glorious exploit".[5]

Nor should it too dogmatically be taken for granted that a particular use of a word in the Ṛgveda must necessarily be older than other uses occurring in later texts and that consequently the latter must have developed from the former.[6] Not only do older meanings sometimes occur in later texts, cases are not rare of specialized uses of a term of a more general meaning being preferred in different genres of literature. In a study of the

des études latines, 35, p. 126 ff., who, taking the antiquated standpoint that Indra is first and foremost the war god interprets many occurrences inaccurately.

[1] V. Henry, in J.A. 1905, II, p. 385.

[2] V. Bhattacharya, in I.H.Q. 9, p. 104 ff.

[3] Compare already Grassmann, Wörterbuch, 1250.

[4] Thus B. Schlerath, in Oriens, 8, p. 320.

[5] For this word see also R. Schmitt, Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit, Wiesbaden 1967, passim.

[6] Cf. also Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, s.v. *gídhra-* "eager; vulture".

much discussed and highly important term *bráhman-*[1] it was argued that the evolutionistic constructions of semantic changes often are too weak to rely upon; that it is difficult to arrange the senses of a term like this in such a manner that a definite historical development may be read off from the very arrangement; that those who adopt these procedures are liable to put too much stress on particular points of secondary importance and to regard coexistent contextual variants as succeeding phases of development, especially when they start from, or attach too much value to, more or less problematical etymological presuppositions. The term *bráhman-* as used in the Veda impresses the reader not rarely as representing an idea such as "inherent firmness" or "fundamental supporting principle", the more specific connotations of which may be understood in definite contexts as the fundamental power inherent in the holy word, ritual etc.

The important words *dhárman-*, *dhárma-*, translated by "established order of things, law etc." were, it is true, summarily studied in connection with some other words of the same semantic sphere *(r̥tá-, vratá-)*,[2] but the development assumed: initially a profane idea, viz. "l'appui concret", and then, gradually, more "une notion abstraite, l'appui moral, la norme et l'ordre établi" and "the idea of duty imposed by religion or by nature" and the observation that the term could also denote a number of more special contextual senses which are either 'concrete' of 'abstract' ("ordre, loi, appui, obligation") fail to carry complete conviction. Distinctions such as 'profane' and 'religious', 'concrete' and 'abstract' are hardly relevant and it would seem better to view the word as fundamentally expressing the central idea of "support, stability, stabilizing or preserving power, maintenance" which in daily, social, religious practice could manifest itself in various ways; that is, being hardly analysed it was one of those words which stood for intuitively felt, associatively combined and emotionally determined 'vague' ideas and was on the basis of that fundamental meaning used according to the circumstances and requirements of the particular contexts so as to develop, deepen and ramify in various ways.[3]

In studying important words of this type there arises an interesting question: did in the concepts or in the range of connotations denoted exist a specific meaning which enabled just this word (e.g. *bráhman-*, *dhárma-* etc.) among several near synonyms to acquire those functions and to have a great future? In a brief monograph on *akṣara*[4] an attempt

---

[1] Gonda, Notes on brahman, Utrecht 1950; see especially p. 58; 70. For other views of this term see Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, II, p. 452.

[2] H. Willman-Grabowska, in R.O. 10 (1934), p. 38 ff.

[3] Gonda, in Tijdschrift voor Philosophie, 20 (Louvain 1958), p. 213 ff. (with a summary in English).

[4] J. A. B. van Buitenen, in J.A.O.S. 79 (1959), p. 176 ff

was made to show that this term, originally denoting the "syllable" as the imperishable basic principle to which everything can be reduced and from which everything can be derived, and going through an interesting evolution, continued to exist, on the one hand, as a word for syllable in the grammatical sense and retained, on the other hand, the significance of first and last principle of the cosmic order, a significance which it seems to have acquired just by meaning "syllable". When the speculations concerning the fundamental importance of the Word became obsolescent the term, persisting as a name for "the absolute" seems to have been reinterpreted as "the imperishable". In another milieu it was specifically identified with the syllable *Oṃ* which became a symbol for the Supreme.

In the ancient vocabulary pertaining to the view of life and the world we should therefore not expect to find well-defined concepts and an unambiguous terminology as is characteristic of a philosophical training, in a modern sense of the term, of long standing. Its terms were symbols for Bewusstseins-inhalte which—in accordance with the views and experience, belief and interpretations of those who used them—gradually developed and deepened, enriching their contents and expanding, by a continual process of assimilation, association, identification, amplification and differentiation, the range of their applicability. These manifold processes can neither be reconstructed by means of the antiquated logico-rhetorical European semantics which have exerted considerable influence upon the compilers of our dictionaries nor by references to the lines of thoughts of modern men.

It is therefore nowadays a generally admitted fact that on the one hand the progress of philological research, a better understanding of the texts and a deeper insight into the structure of Vedic religion often result in a more satisfactory restatement of the meaning of an important term. That means that historical research directed to the elucidation of the development of Vedic terminology should presuppose a systematic inquiry into the structure of the social, religious and other ideas as they synchronously existed in a definite period. Our knowledge of, and insight into, Vedic religion, society and view of the world depend on the other hand largely on a correct understanding of a considerable number of Old Indian words and phrases. However, although many of them have been debated for nearly a century, on their exact sense opinions not rarely continue to diverge widely, and solutions offered with much suggestiveness appear to be, sooner or later, open to justifiable criticism.[1] Among the factors which

---

[1] Gonda, Some notes on the study of Ancient-Indian religious terminology, in History of religions, 1 (Chicago 1962), p. 243 ff.

have contributed to this state of affairs are, of course, the distance in time, space, and cultural environment between Vedic man and most modern Vedists: it is impossible to understand e.g. a term such as *virāj-*, the etymology of which is clear, without a thorough knowledge of the ancient ritual, religious and philosophical speculations:[1] the translation "sovereign" is not adequate; the incompleteness of our sources and their uncommunicativeness on matters we should like to know; the real or possible reinterpretations due to the traditional views of the Indians themselves; the tendency to retain more or less provisional translations; the limitations and prejudices of modern scholars which were often guided by their own religious or philosophical convictions or by their own cultural or political environment: a *vedi-* is not an "altar" but rather "a sacrificial bed or bank", a *yajña-* not a "sacrifice", but rather an "complex of ritual acts of worship"; and last but not least, also some imperfections in the very method applied in semantic research. Deplorably enough, lexicographers in arranging various so-called meanings of the same Indian word, philologists in discussing the connections between different connotations, historians in attempting to discover the so-called original sense of a term of social or religious import often have practically ignored the development of semantics during the last two or three generations. The result is that they have too often failed in disengaging themselves from the antiquated quasi-historical but essentially logical classifications of traditional lexicography, continued to classify complex phenomena of different character under one and the same denominator ("figurative use", "transferred meaning": but by way of which association did this transference come about?), and neglected the results reached, in this century, by those students of general linguistics who have contributed to the advancement of semantics and the refinement of its methods. The study of the meaning and the change of meaning of ancient Indian words and phrases requires not only a thorough philological and historical understanding of the contexts in which these terms occur and a fundamental knowledge of the 'phenomenology' of religion; it should also be abreast of contemporaneous semantics.

The habit of lexicographers to distribute the aspects of the total meaning of a term over a number of 'senses' arranged in an order which, while as a rule largely a product of the ancient procedure of logical classification, impresses the reader as reflecting a historical development—e.g. *daṃsas-*

---

[1] Renou, in J.A. 240, p. 141 ff. See above, p. 176; 180; 194. Santucci, o.c., p. 522 ff. and passim seems too much inclined to explain this term and some of its relatives 'etymologically'.

which always means something like "marvellous skill or power"[1] was said to mean 1)"feat, Meisterwerk; 2) übernatürliches Vermögen"[2]—led also to the assumption of a number of specialized meanings where in reality we have to do with contextual uses.

It is however often overlooked that the very necessity to split up the meaning of a word is due to the fact that, vocabulary being a way in which a community classifies the sum total of its experiences, the 'meanings' of the 'words' are far from being identical in all languages and that therefore our modern languages very often do not possess equivalents which may be used in any context; that our translations are in many cases no more than approximative renderings of definite contextual uses. Though held to be synonymous with words for "place", "birth(place)" and "name" and in addition to these with "house", "body", "light", "might" by the Indian interpreters and translated, by modern scholars, by "dwelling-place, domain", "favourite thing or person, delight", "law, rule", "state, condition", "glory, light" etc. (Monier-Williams) *dhāman-* is, if the present author is not mistaken, only seemingly polyvalent in older texts: it stands for a 'location' or 'presence' of divine power, i.e. not only a 'receptacle' of that power where its presence is experienced, but also a particular way of revealing, presenting or projecting itself.[3] The apparently historical developments assumed by authors on ancient Indian terminology really are, in many cases, pseudo-solutions of pseudo-problems which owe their existence mainly to the mostly untenable supposition that these vague, complex, indefinite prescientific terms are really analysable in different "meanings" which have developed from each other in chronological order and in such a way as would fit preconceived schemes of our devising. When therefore in some recent publications attempts were made to translate important Vedic terms by one single modern European word, there is a strong a priori probability that this translation is inadequate: either the modern word used is misapplied or the Indian term misunderstood: *r̥tá-* is not the equivalent of "truth"[4] nor *vratá-* of the German "Gelübde".[5] Even if such an equivalent is somewhat specified—e.g. Vedic *r̥ta-*, "die Wahrheit", "bezeichnet ausschliesslich die Wahrheit des gesprochenen

---

[1] Gonda, Vision, p. 102.
[2] K. F. Geldner, Der Rigveda in Auswahl, I, Stuttgart 1907, p. 78. Unconvincing also *vr̥jána-* "un territoire circonscrivant un groupe social etc." (Renou, E.V.P. III, p. 20).
[3] Gonda, The meaning of the Sanskrit term *dhāman-*, Amsterdam Acad. 1967.
[4] As is Lüders' opinion in Varuṇa, p. 633 ff.; see Gonda, in Oriens, 13-14, p. 400.
[5] As is held by H. P. Schmidt, Vedisch *vratá* und awestisch *urvăta*, Hamburg 1958. Cf. also V. M. Apte, in B.D.C.R.I. 3, p. 407 ff. whose views are combatted by P. V. Kane, in J.B.B.R.A.S. 29 (1954), p. 1 ff.

Wortes oder des Gedankens"[1]—we are confronted by another difficulty which is likewise minimized by these authors, namely the extreme vagueness of many words and idioms, which being inherent in their meaning in any language, makes the impression of a pronounced feature of the Vedic stock of words. This vagueness which may fade into 'ambiguity' was very well understood by Renou,[2] although not always formulated, linguistically speaking, in the most felicitous way. He was perfectly right in denying that it is due to 'rhetorical punning'; it is no doubt an essential element of the power-loaded mantras, an organic element of to a certain extent esoterical[3] Vedic poetry, a consequence of the identifications and participations of elements belonging to the worldly sphere and the unseen.[4] It is however questionable whether this so-called ambiguity generally meant "double meaning", intentional obscurity, or a sort of 'pathological polysemy'. In evaluating particulars scholars often tend to disagree. Whereas e.g. *juhū́*- "sacrificial ladle" is ṚV. 1,58,7 doubtless to convey also the sense of "tongue", and it has often been supposed that the poet had also in mind the word *jihvā́*- "tongue", a homonym *juhū́*- "tongue" ⟨ **jihū́*- (Av. *hizū́*-)[5] has not found general acceptance. Should we at ṚV. 1,40,5 really take *ókas*- in the double sense of "abode" and "pleasure"?[6] Whereas, moreover, tradition and continuity are greater and older forces in Indian history than some modern scholars are prepared to assume, we should[7] object to asserting anachronistically the applicability of a meaning current in later texts to the older Veda.

The usual procedure not rarely involves other misunderstandings; for instance if two Vedic words usually are, or might be, translated by the same modern term, they are more or less tacitly regarded as synonyms. The ideas expressed by the terms *ṛta*- and *satya*-[8] are however complementary rather than identical:[9] in spite of a considerable number of more or less similar marginal meanings they have a different semantic kernel and

---

[1] Lüders, Varuṇa, p. 635.

[2] e.g. in Renou, E.V.P., passim, and especially in J.A. 231, p. 161 ff. Compare also the same author, Hymnes spéculatifs du Véda, Paris 1956, p. 7: "Le vocabulaire (du Ṛgveda) n'est que partiellement 'sémantisé', je veux dire que des valeurs secondes, implicites, strictement injustifiables, viennent fréquemment interférer avec les acceptions primaires, nous obligeant à imaginer une interprétation à deux ou plusieurs niveaux".

[3] Renou, E.V.P. I, p. 9 etc.

[4] Renou, in Silver Jubilee Volume of Zinbun-Kagaku Kenkyusyo, Kyoto Univ. 1954, p. 309 ff.

[5] E. Benveniste, in Asiatica, Festschrift-F. Weller, Leipzig 1954, p. 30 ff.

[6] Renou, E.V.P. XV, p. 48.

[7] With Wüst, in A.L.B. 25, p. 414 f. with regard to Schmidt's view of *vratá*-.

[8] Both of them meaning "wahr" according to Lüders and hence considered to be "identical" (o.c., p. 406 ff.; 642).

[9] Gonda, in History of religions, 1, p. 254; in Oriens, 13-14, p. 400 f.

range of application. Whereas *r̥ta*- may tentatively be rendered by "universal cosmic law and order", the etymological sense of *satya*-, viz. "related to the *sat*-, i.e. "the existent, the real, the being"" is often undeniable.[1] The contention that *r̥ta*- in R̥V. 1,46,14 is a synonym of *gir*- "praise", *stoma*- "eulogy", *hava*- "invocation" and other words[2] cannot therefore be understood literally.

A very difficult problem to be tackled only with the utmost caution concerns the one-sided character of our sources which almost exclusively originated in the milieus of brahmanical poets, priests and thinkers. It may readily be conceded that, for instance in similes, references to daily life, customs, and technicalities we may catch glimpses of the usage and vocabulary of the general speaker, but this is not to receive an answer to the question as to how far the vocabulary attested to by our texts was used by all members of the Aryan society; how far words which were common in the texts were rare in general usage, or vice versa; what and how many words were never adopted by the authors, to what extent words, common to both strata of society exhibited differences of meaning.[3] Supplying the deficiency of our sources by semantic data found in the later stages of Indo-Aryan or in the related languages involves the serious risk of surreptitiously substituting data which actually were foreign to Old Indian. Attempts at distinguishing a tripartite vocabulary or of threefold meanings of words—dependent on a tripartite structure of society[4]—will generally speaking prove to be abortive, not only for lack of data but also because the language of those ancient Indian milieus which brought forth the authors of the texts was on the whole more or less homogeneous. Neither the authors nor the 'nobles', nor the peasants can be supposed to have lived in watertight compartments, and the vocabulary used by the poets should, like terms and meanings preferred by noblemen, peasants etc., first and foremost be studied as a 'Sondersprache', i.e. a partial and special vocabulary, in this case of poets, priests and thinkers.

That does not alter the fact that in examining the uses and meaning of words attention should be given also to social and occupational factors. In this respect also thorough and complete examinations of the uses of all ramifications of a root are generally speaking likely to produce interesting results. Although for instance the general meaning of the frequent derivatives of *śam*- "to be allayed, oppressed" was well known, a complete pres-

---

[1] According to a later philosopher *r̥ta*- becomes *satya*- when it is practised (Sureśvara, Taittirīyopan. Bh. V. 1, 47).

[2] Lüders, o.c., p. 438.

[3] Remember the curious deviations of e.g. Pāli from epic and classical Sanskrit.

[4] Cf. W. P. Schmid, in Mélanges-L. Renou, Paris 1968, p. 624.

entation of facts and a study of all relevant text places[1] has brought to light a number of valuable particulars such as contextual applications, relations to so-called synonyms and opposites, the limits of the vagueness which is an inherent feature of the sense of a word, and special applications in definite religious usage. It should be emphasized that we may not rarely derive more exact or reliable information on the central or more fundamental meaning of a word from later, but, for instance technical, archaic or formulaic passages than from chronologically older texts.[2]

Nor should we deny the existence of indubitable specializations. A good instance of an important term which notwithstanding its simple elementary meaning is full of implications is *nirukta-*.[3] Expressing first the idea of "said aloud and in an intelligible way, enunciated" it characterizes a formula the meaning or the use of which result distinctly from its content alone. Thus the term came to be applied to everything that has a definite outline or is definitely organized, *ánirukta-* to that which is not, or hardly, definable. For the ritual specialists it became tempting to qualify as *ánirukta-* a deity whose presence at the rites was ardently desired and whose absence in the most sacred formulas was much regretted, that is Prajāpati, the ritual practices directed to whom are executed silently.

An important object for systematic research would be a consistent comparison between the in many respects more antique vocabulary of the Ṛgveda and that of several other corpora of the Vedic and post-Vedic literatures in order to determine as exactly as possible the facts relating to the development of the stock of words used by the authors. Some old words survive for instance only as parts of compounds, many others begin their historical existence as substantives or adjectives and end as fixed epithets or proper nouns;[4] others again revived as archaisms or continued to exist in the Middle Indian languages.

It was recently, and rightly, observed that the study of so-called linguistic palaeontology, that is of the pre-historic and proto-historic culture mainly based on linguistic facts, was characterized by a comparative neglect of verbal roots which should have engaged attention in order to determine with greater exactitude, for instance, the occupational activities of ancient Indian society.[5] It should however be borne in mind that the 'meanings' ascribed to verbal roots often are vague abstractions and only with special caution utilizable for the above purpose. It is quite true that

---

[1] D. J. Hoens, Śānti, Thesis Utrecht 1951.
[2] See also Sommer, in M.S.S. 11, p. 5 ff.
[3] L. Renou and L. Silburn, in L. Sarup Memorial Volume, Hoshiarpur 1954, p. 68 ff.
[4] Renou, Introduction générale, p. 12 f.; 64.
[5] Cf. O. H. de A. Wijesekera, in A.B.O.R.I. 48-49 (1968), p. 162.

the translations given in the dictionaries are not rarely misleading, but there are other risks to be avoided, viz. placing too much reliance on more or less acceptable etymological relationship and isolating a Vedic word group from its cognates in the later language (Sanskrit) or (Indo-Aryan) languages if it is represented there. In determining for instance the meaning of the root (word group) *kḷp*- in ancient Vedic texts (*kálpate* translated by "to be well ordered", *kalpáyati* "to distribute, apportion, arrange") the vague possibilities of prehistoric root connections *(*kel-, *ker-)*[1] cannot, in my opinion, carry weight.

These remarks are however not to deny that a reconsideration of the 'meaning' of a root may often be fruitful. The relations between the noun *rā́j-, rā́j-an-* "king, chief", and the meanings of the cognate verbs *(ṛj-ya-ti, ṛ-ñ-j-á-ti, rā́j-a-ti)* and the prehistoric semasiology of this word group may be elucidated by a study of the ancient (Indo-European and Indian) ideas of kingship, the institutions to which it had given rise, and to epithets etc. used in connection with the king. From this it seems to appear that the relation between I.E. *rēĝ-* > Ved. *rāj-* "king" and the root **reĝ-* "to extend, stretch" does not, as is suggested by some dictionaries, point to the king's being a "Lenker" (to adopt the German word) but rather to the connections of this sacral figure with width and broadness, to his extending, as a mediator, heavenly blessings to his country and subjects over whom he stretches out in protection his long and mighty arms.[2]

Not rarely semantic puzzles induce scholars to venture on hypotheses with regard to the prehistoric state of affairs. The Old Indian *urvárā-* "field yielding crop" and the Avestan *urvarā-* "plant" have, in spite of the difference of meaning long been identified. Attempts to decide which meaning was more original were necessarily attended with some efforts to find cognates outside Indo-Aryan. However, neither formally nor semantically may the puzzle be said to have been solved, connections with Gr. ἄρουρα "cornfield" being[3] highly doubtful and an analysis *urvárā-* < **urv- -álā-*, a prehistoric compound consisting of **urvan-* (in Avestan "soul" and the root **al-* "to grow"), seeds and plants growing through the souls of the deceased,[4] however ingenious, too disputable a hypothesis.

That the semasiology of a word group which impresses us as being borrowed from a pre-Aryan substratum may confront us with serious difficulties is self-evident. For the time being hypotheses with regard to an 'original' meaning[5] will as a rule be rather hazardous.

[1] Wijesekera, o.c., p. 163 ff.
[2] Gonda, in K.Z. 73, p. 151 ff.
[3] Notwithstanding Bailey, in T.P.S. 1960, p. 79 ff.
[4] Thieme, Studien zur indogerm. Wortkunde …, Leipzig Acad., Berlin 1952, p. 58.
[5] See e.g. Kuiper, Rigvedic *kirín-* and *kríḷi-* in I.L., Turner Jubilee Vol. I (1958), p. 349 ff.

An example of a term which while being of interest from the point of view of the history of Indian culture presents semantic as well as etymological difficulties is *kalá-*. The primary meaning is in the eyes of some lexicographers "a small part of a whole, especially a sixteenth part"—the latter idea as well as the number sixteen play an important role in Indian thought[1]—and a secondary "the digit or one-sixteenth of the moon's diameter", whereas others prefer to invert this order or to connect the sense of "one sixteenth" with the four fourth parts of an animal's four hoofs. Various attempts at deriving the word from an I.E. source failed to carry conviction, although there would be parallels—which however have only heuristic and illustrative value—of words for a small particle or unit developing from a root for "splitting off" (one suggestion is relationship to Gr. κελέϊς "battle-axe"). A Dravidian etymology,[2] connecting it with *kālá-* "(fixed point of) time", was far from being generally received.[3] A thorough examination of Indian numerical systems and allied subjects may be expected to throw fresh light on this point. This word and *kalá-* "(any practical or fine) art" (sixty-four of which being enumerated) were formerly identified, but nowadays mostly separated, opinions being divided on the origin of the latter (Dravidian: Tamil *kalai* "art, learning, science",[4] or Indo-European?).[5] Groups of semantically related words were occasionally studied in connection with their synonyms and etymological relatives in other Indo-European languages.[6] That such a comparative study of Old Indian words or word groups and their cognates is in many cases worth while may for instance appear from the inquiry into the family of *priyá-* which does not only express the idea of "dear" but also that of "one's own", the latter meaning making the relations with the German group *frei* usw. more intelligible.[7] It may however be observed that the modern terms used to translate the adjective *priyá-*—and many other words—are not mutually synonymous; that is to say German *lieb*, Dutch *lief*, and English *dear* cannot serve indiscriminately in rendering the same Vedic text place. Moreover, some speakers of the same languages find "dear", for instance

---

[1] For a more detailed discussion: J. Gonda, Change and continuity in Indian religion, The Hague 1965, p. 119 f.
[2] M. Collins, On the octaval system of reckoning in India, in Dravidic Studies, 4, Madras 1926, p. 7.
[3] Kuiper, Proto-Munda words, p. 49.
[4] J. Bloch, in B.S.O.S. 5 (1930), p. 730 ff.; T. Burrow, in B.S.O.A.S. 12, p. 371.
[5] Both words identical and I.E.: F. O. Schrader, in A.L.B. 1, p. 25.
[6] K. Brugmann, Zu den Benennungen der Personen des dienenden Standes in den idg. Sprachen, in I.F. 19 (1906), p. 377 ff.; J. Charpentier, on words for milk, in M.O. 18, p. 34 ff.; on the same subject: A. Meillet, in I.L. 2 (Grierson Comm. Vol., Lahore 1933), p. 35 ff
[7] M. Scheller, Vedisch *priyá-* und die Wortsippe *frei, freien, freund*, Göttingen 1959.

in connection with one's body or limbs, possible, whereas others would prefer "one's own".[1]

---

[1] Cf. J. Gonda, Notes on names, Amsterdam 1970, p. 40 ff. (on *priya-* and *cāru-*). Studies such as Hj. Frisk, 'Wahrheit' und 'Lüge' in den indogermanischen Sprachen, Göteborg Univ. 1935 cannot be considered here.

ETYMOLOGY

The authors of the Vedic texts provide us with numerous 'etymological' explanations of words. Although the generality of these are from a modern point of view complete failures, they were often misunderstood by those scholars who qualified them as quibbles, puns or products of childish fantasies.[1] Many of them are worthy of our serious consideration, because they represent an important stage in the development of the linguistic thought of the Indians. Many occur also in the Nirukta, and the method adopted in this ancient etymological work ($\pm$ V[th] century B.C.)[2] is similar to that which was in vogue among ritualists and philosophers for whom these etymologies—based upon the conviction that there exists an intimate relation between objects and their names and that therefore a meaning derived from the etymology can be shown to be applicable to an object— were an important means of penetrating into the truth and reality lying behind the phenomena.[3] The insight is moreover gaining ground that a fixed conviction concerning the etymology of an important term or name, that means, the firm belief in an intimate association between the bearer of an important name and an idea, concept or verbal process—e.g. of *brahman-* with the root *bṛh-* "to be strong, to increase"[4] and of Viṣṇu with roots for "entering" or "penetrating"[5]—has not rarely given expression to important aspects of the ideas denoted and contributed significantly to the growing importance and popularity of these terms and the concepts they stood for.[6]

While some indigenous explications are sensible or open to discus-

---

[1] See J. Gonda, The etymologies in the ancient Indian brāhmaṇas, in Lingua, 5 (1955), p. 61 ff.; cf. also M. A. Mehendale, Upaniṣadic etymologies, in Bhāratīya Vidyā, 20-21 (Bombay 1963), p. 40 ff.

[2] Many scholars were of the opinion that Yāska preceded Pāṇini, but P. Thieme, in Z.D.M.G. 84 (1935), p. *23 f. adduced weighty arguments in favour of the opposite view.

[3] For a detailed exposition and many instances: Gonda, o.c.; J. Charpentier, in M.O. 13, p. 3 erroneously created the impression that there is a hard-and-fast line between the (pseudo-)etymological constructions of the ancient grammarians and those found in texts that were not influenced by their theories. The fact that for instance the tiger (*vyāghra-*) is in epic texts described as scenting out its prey does not prove that the grammarians were right in deriving the animal's name from *ā-ghrā-* "to smell". For *vyāghra-* see Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, III, p. 274.

[4] Gonda, Brahman, p. 18 ff.

[5] Gonda, Aspects of early Viṣṇuism, p. 54 f.

[6] See also J. A. B. van Buitenen, in J.A.O.S. 79 (1959), p. 187.

sion, others can even stand any criticism on the part of modern scholar-
ship, and cases are not wanting in which an old Indian etymology, whether
it is correct or not, has more to recommend it than a modern one: *naga-*
"mountain, tree" held to mean "not moving" is certainly not a cognate of
German *Nachen* "boat" (originally "Einbaum",?). Many others are good
instances of popular etymology: *vaiḍūrya-* "cat's-eye gem" which has now
been explained as Dravidian (from the place-name *Vellūr*) was according
to Pāṇini 4, 3, 84 a derivative of *vidūra-* "very remote". The noun *óṣadhī-*,
óṣadhi- "(medicinal) herb" was already in Vedic times associated with
oṣá- "burning" and in this century explained as "containing *(-dhi-)* heat",
plants being considered to bear a fiery potency.[1] It can however be ob-
jected that the accentuation of the compounds with *-dhi-* "receptacle" is
different and that the form with *-ī-* cannot derive from the root *dhā-*, *dhi-*
"to place etc." Various other suggestions were made and found inadequate.
In view of the fact that the word was also connected with *dháyati* "he
sucks, drinks" (ŚB. 2, 2, 4, 5), to which belong forms with *ī* such as *dhītá-*,
we might think of a double attempt to adapt a word for "herb" by way of
popular etymology.

   A considerable part of those important etymologies which we now re-
gard as self-evident and which together with the grammatical forms are so
to say the framework of the Indo-European structure of the Vedic lan-
guage were established at an early date: *dyaús* "sky, heaven, day (also as
a god)": Gr. Ζεύς etc.; *pitár-* "father": Gr. πατήρ, Lat. *pater* etc.; *ávi-*
"sheep": Gr. ὄις, Lat. *ovis* etc.; *áśva-* "horse": Lat. *equus*. Yet A. F. Pott
(1802-1887)[2] and his predecessors, while being near to identifying Sanskrit
with the parent language, had in discussing Indo-European etymologies
no clear idea of the character of the so-called sound laws and other pro-
cesses by which originally identical forms tend to differentiate. It is there-
fore not surprising, that notwithstanding the notable advancement toward
better understanding of the underlying processes and the improvement in
the comparative method,—a culminating point being reached when in the
seventies a series of important discoveries was made and linguistic meth-
ods were fundamentally revised—, many mistakes were committed and
wrong equations proposed, some of which were hard to kill, surviving in
popular books or given a new lease of life to buttress up weak arguments
and hazardous theories. I only recall the identification of *bráhman-* and

---

[1] J. Ph. Vogel, Het Sanskrit woord *tejas*, Amsterdam Acad. 1930, p. 35.
[2] A. F. Pott, Etymologische Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen
Sprachen, Detmold 1833-36.

brahmán- with Lat. *flāmen*[1] "a priest of a particular god" which, though phonetically and semantically questionable and often with good reason rejected, served in 1935 and many times afterwards, with other, often still less convincing etymologies as one of the keystones of G. Dumézil's full-fledged theory of prehistoric Indo-European mythology and sociology.[2] Other early equations which were not proof against a reconsideration in the light of the exact sound-correspondences required, after the seventies, for etymological investigations are, e.g. *mū̆la-* "root", of which we know now that it has nothing to do[3] with Gr. μῶλυ "a fabulous herb"[4]; *mūrá-* "foolish" which probably is foreign to Gr. μωρός "dull, sluggish"; not to mention notorious equations in the mythological sphere such as *sārameyá-* "son of *Sarámā-*, a female dog belonging to the gods": Ἑρμείας (the Greek god Hermes). It hardly needs emphasizing—yet it has too often been forgotten[5]—that etymological combinations can only be regarded as valuable hypotheses if they are based on a solid philological foundation, that is on an interpretation of the texts which, taking account of all relevant auxiliary learning (general history of religion etc.), may be considered correct for the time being.

The tendency to follow the Indian grammarians in deriving as many nouns as possible from verbal roots led the earlier generations of comparatists to explain, for instance, *duhitár-* "daughter" as "the milker" (*duh-* "to milk")[6] and sometimes also to draw, from these associations, conclusions about prehistoric life and thought. Later on scholars wisely came to proceed with more reserve and caution so that even an association of long standing: *dám-*, *dáma-* "house" and **dem-* (Gr. δέμω etc.) "to build" was with good reason regarded as untenable;[7] an attempt has been made to show that *dám-*, *dáma-* "house" originally denoted the social concept of "the community of the relatives living in the same house" (cf. *dámūna-* "householder"); and that in the course of time ("metaphorically" or under the influence of a homonymous word belonging to **dem-*, ?) it assumed a material meaning.[8]

---

[1] L. Meyer, Vergleichende Grammatik der griechischen und lateinischen Sprache, Berlin 1865, II, p. 275; see also Gonda, Brahman, p. 6 ff.; 74 f.; Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, II, p. 454 f.

[2] For particulars see the bibliographical notes in Gonda, l.c., and Mayrhofer. l.c.

[3] As was assumed by Uhlenbeck, Wörterbuch, p. 229.

[4] But see R. Ferrari, in Rendiconti Ist. Lombardo, 88 (1955), p. 18 f. and L. Lombardo, ibidem 91, p. 253 f.

[5] Hence also the well-known distrust on the part of those philologists who hold aloof 27f. from linguistic studies. See e.g. H. Oldenberg, Vedaforschung, Stuttgart-Berlin 1905, p.

[6] e.g. Chr. Lassen, F. Bopp, A. Weber, rejected by Chr. Bartholomae (1904). Cf. also Petr. Dict., s.v. *agni-* "fire": perhaps from *aj-* "to drive" because of the mobility of fire.

[7] E. Benveniste, in B.S.L. 51, p. 15 ff.

[8] Benveniste, l.c., referring to ṚV. 1, 60, 4.

During the decades before and after the turn of the century, the main obvious etymologies being generally accepted and dubious hypotheses continuing to provide material for discussion, much energy was, not in the last place by Swedish scholars,[1] spent and in most cases wasted by attempts at explaining Sanskrit vocables, often of rare occurrence, with the help of theories of root variation and determination, the assumption of meta-thesis, dissimilation, contamination, shortening and other phenomena which, though by no means rare in well-known languages, may in tracing prehistoric connections easily open the door to abuse.[2] Thus *uṣṇíhā-* "nape of the neck" was supposed to go back to **ugh-s-n-íghā-* and connected with Gr. αὐχήν "neck"; *kúṣṭha-* "dewclaw" (?) was connected with Gr. κύστις "bladder", etc.

Strange to say authors did not even shrink from explaining by far-fetched subtleties names of indigenous plants and animals, such as e.g. *líbujā-* "creeping plant";[3] *píppala-* "(berry of the) ficus religiosa";[4] *camará-* "bos grunniens";[5] *palāśá-* which means "leaf" as well as "the blossom of the butea frondosa" was put into connection with Lat. *plectere*[6] "to plait, braid"; *phaṇá-* "froth, scum" with Lithuanian *pìlti* "to pour".[7] Some names of birds are onomatopoeias rather than genetically related to German or Slavonic words.[8] Suggestions which are not formally as well as semantically flawless cannot generally speaking be regarded as convincing[9]: the assumption that one and the same root **kʷel-* diverged in Indo-Iranian to produce *car-* "to move, go" (this meaning is not complete) and *kṛ-* "to do, make"[10] does not, for instance, conform to this requirement. Words for plants, seeds and their products were often transformed and adapted in contravention of normal sound rules so that even at first sight plausible etymologies are not rarely fallacious. We should therefore note

[1] See e.g. some publications by K. F. Johansson (in I.F. 8, p. 160 ff.; 12, p. 112 ff.; 14, p. 265 ff.; 34, p. 235 ff.); J. Charpentier, in K.Z. 40 (1907), p. 425 ff.; 46 (1914), p. 25 ff.; H. Petersson, in I.F. 34 (1914/15), p. 222 ff.; Uhlenbeck, Wörterbuch.

[2] This is not to say that these abortive studies never contained useful remarks or valuable collections of facts. Thus Johansson's article on *nepathya-* (Uppsala Univ. Årsskrift, 1927, p. 1-50) merits attention because of a number of interesting observations on the prefix *ni-*.

[3] After several unsuccessful suggestions (e.g. Lat. *lābrusca* "the wild vine") P. Tedesco, in J.A.O.S. 67, p. 88 (ingeniously but unacceptably: *[li]bujā-: (pari)bhuj-* "to embrace").

[4] Walde-Pokorny, Wörterbuch, II, p. 127.

[5] e.g. with Engl. *hind*!

[6] Cf. Uhlenbeck, Wörterbuch, p. 160.

[7] J. Scheftelowitz, in K.Z. 53, p. 250.

[8] As was assumed by Petersson, K.Z. 46, p. 128 ff. and others.

[9] e.g. *lakṣá-* "stake": Gr. λάχος "allotted portion" (Thieme, in K.Z. 69, p. 211). See Benveniste, in B.S.L. 51, p. 14 ff.

[10] Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 324.

with reserve ingenious attempts at establishing an I.E. etymology for e.g. *sarṣápa-* "mustard" with the original meaning: "of the flavour of salt" (cf. Lat. *sal* "salt" and *sapĕre* "to taste").[1]

A reconsideration of the character and structure of a grammatical form may lead to the rejection of a commonly accepted, or to higher appreciation of a discarded, etymology. Thus the possibility of a connection between *abhi-dāsati* "to nurse inimical feelings against somebody, to aim at somebody as an enemy" and Gr. δήω "to find"[2] was again taken into account when the current explanation of the Indian verb as a denominative of *dāsa-* "slave, enemy"[3] appeared to be incorrect, this verb—which occurs almost exclusively in subordinate clauses—originally being rather a petrified -s-aorist of a root *dā-* which already in the Ṛgveda was re-interpreted as an indicative.[4]

In other cases traditional etymologies underwent a partial modification: *ātman-* "principle of life, kernel of the personality" is also nowadays connected with German *ātem* "breath" etc. but no longer with *aniti* "he breathes"; more recent attempts at tracing its origin[5] are not however more convincing.

The disentanglement of more or less identical forms and the establishment of their etymologies or their subsumption under definite roots on the strength of a more accurate determination of their meanings has in the last decades been another object for reconsideration. The handbooks not rarely combine what is to be separated and confound forms of different origin. This confusion is often fostered by a tendency, proper to many etymologists, to collect under one and the same root—which then is assumed to express a very vague meaning and to admit of being manifoldly varied or extended—as many words as seems possible. Cases are indeed not rare in which forms traditionally recorded in our Sanskrit dictionaries under one entry were, in the course of time, shown to belong to two different word families.[6] Thus the root present *dáti* "he mows" and the always

---

[1] Wüst, PHMA, 2 (1956), p. 59 ff.; Thieme, in Z.D.M.G. 111, p. 106 ff.
[2] Proposed by De Saussure, Mémoire, p. 173.
[3] Pokorny, Wörterbuch, p. 217; Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, I, p. 38.
[4] J. Narten, in K.Z. 78, p. 56 ff.
[5] See e.g. Thumb-Hauschild, Handbuch, II, p. 182.
[6] Sometimes a semantic bridge may with more or less probability be built between two homonymous Vedic roots which were traditionally regarded as identical: cf. K. Hoffmann, in K.Z. 83, p. 193 ff. on *am-* "to take hold of" and *am-* "to swear". Homonymy in verbal roots was of course a recognized phenomenon when the various meanings are obviously distinct. Instead of a traditionally assumed *píparti* (root *pṝ-*) "to fill"—a homonym of *píparti* "to bring over"—only the 3ʳᵈ sing. impf. med. *ápiprata : prā-* (cf. *tiṣṭhati : sthā-*) is from the historical point of view interesting (J. Narten, in Studia classica et orientalia-A. Pagliaro, III, Roma 1969, p. 139 ff.).

compound *(áva) dyati* "he divides, cuts off" with the root aorist *avā́dīt* should be disunited and regarded as belonging to two different roots *dā-*, the former being, in the Veda, limited to the present, the other constituting an 'aorist root'.[1] There are two ranges of meaning, viz. "to sing, celebrate" and "to honour, welcome", which, though mixed up in the dictionaries under one root *gr̥-*, really belong to two different roots, the former producing a verbal adjective *gīrṇá-*, the latter an adjective *gūrtá-* (cf. Lat. *grātus*);[2] we now distinguish *math-* "to rob" from *ma(n)th-* "to whirl";[3] *jambh-* "to open the jaws wide in order to snap at ..." from *jambh-* "to crush";[4] *spr̥-* "to win, obtain" from *spr̥-* "to release, extricate";[5] *pra sisarti* "he reaches out" (object the arms) may with Latin *pro-sĕro* "I put out" (the tongue) belong to a root *ser-* "to extend, reach out etc.".[6] Not all suggestions were however generally approved,[7] but it is strange that the word group represented by *dā́myati* "he is tamed etc."—which in former times must have implied the idea of rigorous subjection—should almost up to the present day[8] have been considered "an ancient branch" of the root for "building" *dem-*, an identification which indeed is beyond any acceptability, notwithstanding English *domestic* and *domesticate*.[9] A good example of a word group about which opinions have long been divided[10] is *rā́j-*, *rā́jan-* "king"; *rā́ṣṭi* "he reigns"; *rā́jati* "he reigns, governs; is illustrious, shines"; the latter verb was often taken to represent two roots, but in consideration of the close association between splendour or illustriousness and kingship "to shine" is rather an Indian semantic development.[11]

[1] Narten, Sigmatische Aoriste, p. 138; Verb, p. 130; against the Petersburg Dictionary, III, p. 577 ff.; Whitney, Roots, p. 72; Buck, Selected synonyms, p. 507; Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, II, p. 31 etc. If two or three verbs are semantically related, 'Formüberschneidungen' may present serious difficulties (Narten, in M.S.S. 14, p. 39 ff.).

[2] T. Burrow, in B.S.O.A.S. 20 (1957), p. 133 ff.

[3] Narten, in I.I.J. 4, p. 121 ff.

[4] Narten, in K.Z. 79 (1965), p. 255 f.

[5] J. Wackernagel, in K.Z. 67 (1942), p. 176.

[6] Gonda, in Mnemosyne 1938, p. 169; otherwise Thieme, in Z.D.M.G. 111, p. 111 not quoting Gonda.

[7] See e.g. Burrow, in J.R.A.S. 1956, p. 191 ff. on *lubh-*; F. B. J. Kuiper, in Z.I.I. 8, p. 251 ff. on *dáyate* "he destroys" and *dáyate* "he divides" (?) and compare Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, s. v. *máṃhate, vanóti, várṇaḥ*; for interesting complications (*mr̥ṇā́ti* "crushes" and *mr̥ṇā́ti* "seizes") ibidem, II, p. 672 f.; for *minā́ti* "exchanges" and *minā́ti* "damages" ibidem, II, p. 636.

[8] See e.g. Walde-Pokorny, Wörterbuch, I, p. 788; but compare Benveniste, in B.S.L. 51, p. 15 ff.

[9] I also refer to Burrow, Skt. *lubh-* "to disturb", in J.R.A.S. 1956, p. 191 ff., drawing attention also to the similarity in meaning of the roots *lubh-* "to disturb", *yup-* and *lup-*, and to W. P. Schmid, in I.F. 62, p. 219, distinguishing *yā* "to request" from *yā-* "to go". For the relation between *ipsati* "to wish to obtain" and *āpnoti* "to obtain" see P. Kretschmer, in K.Z. 31, p. 380; M. Leumann, Morphol. Neuerungen, p. 47; S. Insler, in I.F. 73, p. 57 ff.

[10] In other cases the discussion continues; see e.g. Strunk, Nasalpräsentien, p. 112 ff. and Narten, Verb, p. 132 ff. on *str̥ṇā́ti* etc.

[11] Gonda, in K.Z. 73, p. 164 f.

Attention was for instance drawn to the occurrence of words belonging to the same semantic field and associated with each other by rhyme (is *bhagála-* "skull" a transformation of another word under the influence of the synonymous *kapála-?; índu-* "drop", *bindú-* and *vindu-* "drop, spot") whatever their mutual relation—recent attempts at explaining the longer forms as prehistoric compounds **b-indu-* $\langle$ **p-indu-*, *p-* being the weak grade of *āp-*, *ap-* "water"[1] are however likely to carry us back to the infancy of comparative linguistics—; to the possibility of homonyms becoming one word: *pátra-* "receptacle" and *pátra-* "goblet";[2] to contaminations or transformations under the influence of similar words:[3] *rambh-*, *skambh-*, *stambh-* may have produced *dambh-* beside *dabh-* "to injure"; to retrograde derivation: *sura-* "god" formed from *asura-* in the sense of "opponent of the gods" (popular etymology);[4] to the probability of haplology: *madúgha-* "a definite sweet herb" $\langle$ *madhudúgha-* "yielding sweetness"; or of reduplicative formations: *dadhi-* "thick sour milk" may belong to *dhayati* "he sucks, drinks"; *pāpa-* "evil", if related to *pāmán-* and this may be taken to mean "bringer or bearer of evil" (in the texts it appears as "a skin-disease"): cf. Gr. πῆμα "misery". The possibility of adaptation by way of 'popular etymology', often not recognized in former days, and of onomatopoeia etc. interferes with serious attempts at tracing origins: *aśvattha-* "ficus religiosa" with *aśva-* "horse" and *stha-* "stand" is rather an adaptation of a non-Aryan word;[5] *bhéka-* "frog"; *dundubhi-* "kettle-drum"[6] are, or may be, cases of onomatopoeia. Puzzling questions[7] as to the possibility of 'Elementarverwandtschaft', fortuitous similarity or the possibility of (prehistoric) borrowing in the Indo-Iranian period cannot detain us here.

A more correct statement of the meaning of a word may add to the probability of an etymology provisionally adopted by former authors: *api-vat-*, according to the Petersburg Dictionary "to understand", rather means "to inspire":[8] cf. Lat. *vātēs* "(inspired) seer, foreteller".[9] This is

---

[1] Discussions XVII. Deutscher Orientalistentag, Würzburg 1968. A similar dissection of a short word into a prehistoric compound suggested in the case of *baka-* "heron" (*b-ak-a-*, *ak-* being related to *ákṣi-* "eye", hence "the bird which looks at, or into, the water") can by no means be substantiated; the word may rather be considered an onomatopoeia or be drawn from the substratum.

[2] Otherwise: Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, II, p. 253.

[3] Narten, in M.S.S. 14, p. 39 ff.

[4] For a disputed case: Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, I, p. 371, s.v. *caturáḥ*.

[5] Notwithstanding Uhlenbeck, Wörterbuch p. 17 and others.

[6] See however Kuiper, Proto-Munda words, p. 84 ff.

[7] See e.g. Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, II, p. 540 ff. s.v. *mákṣā-* "fly".

[8] Thieme, in Festschrift-F. Weller, Leipzig 1954, p. 656 ff.

[9] See Uhlenbeck, Wörterbuch, p. 268.

not to say that discussions will soon be terminated. The at first sight strange double meaning of *nāgá-*, "elephant" and "snake, serpent-demon", becomes intelligible, if from the etymologies published in the course of time we choose the one which phonetically is most satisfactory, viz. identity with Lithuanian *nuogas* "naked" etc.:[1] it is the striking nakedness which both animals have in common. However, the weak point is the absence of the meaning "(the) naked (one)" in India, where the elephant must have been given this name.

That the etymology of a word, if we have the option between two possibilities, should be in harmony with a striking characteristic of the object or idea denoted was the implication of an argument[2] in favour of the connection of *ghṛtá-* "ghee, sacrificial butter" with *gharmá-* "glow, heat" (and not with *jígharti* "he besprinkles") because a prolonged heating is the main characteristic of the preparation of this stuff.

The situation may present itself that two or three mutually exclusive etymologies are defended, the authors being agreed only upon the I.E. descent of the word under discussion, and the critical reviewer remaining unconvinced by both or all of them. Connecting *āścarya-* "rare, curious, marvellous; wonder" with Old Icelandic *skars* "giantess"[3] is for semantical reasons beyond acceptability; deriving it from an otherwise, strictly speaking, unknown interjection of astonishment *āḥ* which may have existed in colloquial speech and the root *car-*[4] as "ein Tun, zu dem man *āḥ* ausruft"[5] dispatches too lightly the complete absence of the verbal combination *āḥ car-* in our texts and *a fortiori* of its occurrence in syntactic constructions which would produce this *āścarya-*; supposing its (unattested) original sense to have been "over which one must stumble (in order to find it)" and its root *skhal-* "to stumble", or rather a North-Western form **skhar-*,[6] does not inspire confidence because there are no parallels for the variation or transition *kh/c* and a verb *ā-skhal-* "to stumble at" has not been found. Although an etymology, if not evident at first sight, is a matter of a certain degree of probability, an accumulation of mere possibilities (among which the semantic shift) does not carry us any further.—For the untranslatable term *vratá-* "order, mode or form of life (in accordance with socio-religious norms), fixed and regular behaviour, observance, vow, function etc." even nine or ten different etymologies

---

[1] See e.g. Walde-Pokorny, Wörterbuch, II, p. 339; Thieme, in K.Z. 78, p. 178.
[2] Charpentier, in M.O. 18, p. 42 ff.
[3] Walde-Pokorny, Wörterbuch, I, p. 518.
[4] Cf. Pāṇini, 6, 1, 147.
[5] Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, II, 2, p. 829; Kuiper, in I.I.J. 5 (1961), p. 136 ff.
[6] Thieme, in K.Z. 78 (1963), p. 104 ff.

were proposed: *vṛ-* "to choose", *vṛ-* "to obstruct, surround, cover", I.E. *ṷer-* "to speak", I.E. *ṷert-* "to turn, revolve", a root for "being powerful" etc., none of them carrying conviction.[1]—Words of disputed and obscure origin have always elicited bold or uncritical guesses, but we had better completely reject such recent phonetically unacceptable combinations as, for instance, that of *átka-* "garment" with Gr. ἀσκός "skin" (both words deriving from *ajá-* "he-goat")[2] or semantically objectionable etymologies based on hazardous prehistoric or historical hypotheses such as the connection of the above *vrata-* with Celtic and other words for "prince, dominion, be powerful".[3]—For over a century there has been much controversial discussion about the word *strī́-* "woman". In view of *jáni-tṛ-ī́-* "mother" (Lat. *genetrix*) it seemed reasonable to look for a similar derivation: hence the suggestion to connect it with *sū́-* "to bring forth" and to assume syncope of the root vowel.[4] As however reliable phonetic parallels seem, in Old Indian, to be wanting[5] and the identity of one single sound (viz. the *s*) is a weak foundation to rely upon we had better be sceptical.

Attempts at establishing, by means of supposed deviations of sound laws, original meanings of the Indian representants of more or less widespread I.E. words such as *yúvan-* "youth", which has nothing to do with *javate* "he hurries on, is quick",[6] are on the other hand completely antiquated. In many cases we should for the time being be content with some probable or potential cognates in other I.E. languages without stressing the necessity of establishing formal identity or unambiguous root association (*paláva-* "chaff, husk": Russian *polóva* "chaff" etc.) or with the conclusion that an Indian and another I.E. word are seemingly, not really, identical.[7]

The occurrence, in the Veda, of 'Prākritisms' of common usage being not beyond possibility, *páṇate* "he barters, buys" has been explained as a Middle Indian form of a thematized nasal present *pṛ-ṇā́-ti (cf. Lithuanian *peĺnas* "earnings, gains"). When *metri causa* to be read dissyllabically *duhitā́* "daughter" may probably be replaced by the (hypocoristically)

---

[1] H. P. Schmidt, Vedisch *vrata* und awestisch *urvắta*, Hamburg 1958, p. 7 ff.; 146; Thieme, in I.I.J. 3 (1959), p. 150; Wüst, PHMA, 7 (1961), p. 66 ff.; the same, in A.L.B. 25 (1961), p. 414 ff.; V. M. Apte, in B.D.C.R.I. 3, p. 407 ff.; P. V. Kane, in J.B.B.R.A.S. 29, 1 ff.

[2] e.g. F. Specht, in K.Z. 66, p. 220; Thieme, quoted by Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, I, p. 27. For another improbable attempt: Wüst, PHMA, 4, p. 59 ff.

[3] Wüst, o.c., p. 68 ff.

[4] A. F. Pott, Etymologische Forschungen, ²II, p. 1323; V. Pisani, in K.Z. 71 (1954), p. 241.; O. Szemerényi, Syncope in Greek and Indo-European, Naples 1964, p. 398 f.

[5] Mayrhofer, in K.Z. 72, p. 118 f.

[6] As was believed by A. Weber in Festgruss-R. von Roth, Stuttgart 1893, p. 131 ff.

[7] See e.g. Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, II, p. 349.

shortened Middle Indian *dhītā̆*.[1] The *jj* in *bhṛjjáti* "he roasts" may in this colloquial term be explained as Middle Indian for *-jy-*. The advocate of a Prākritism will sometimes throw doubt upon a traditional explanation: *áñjasā-* "quickly", long considered the instrumental of *áñjas-* "ointment" (lit. "smoothly"), was also connected with *(abhi-) ṛñj-* "to hasten towards" (*ṛ > a* in Prākrit).[2] The importance of the Prākrit elements was, however, more than once exaggerated, or upheld by too superficial[3] or complicated hypotheses, especially in the decades immediately before a more correct evaluation of the substratum gained ground.[4] Nowadays scholars have justified scruples about deriving[5] *pāṇí-* "hand" from **parni-* (cf. Gr. παλάμη "palm of the hand"). A more recent explanation of *mālā-* "wreath, garland" as a Middle Indian development from **v(a)rtman-*: *vṛt-* "to turn round"[6] is indeed much less probable than the supposition of a foreign (Dravidian) origin. The adjective *baṇḍá-* "maimed" can hardly be a Prākritism instead of *vṛddha-* "cut off".[7] It was moreover argued that seeming Prākritisms such as instances of cerebralization or aspiration could also, or rather, be regarded as due to non-Indo-Aryan origin.[8] In other cases two advocates of Prākrit influence disagree with regard to the solutions propounded: however, for *píṇḍa-* "globe, clod, lump" neither **piṃzḍa-* "crushed" nor **piṃṣṭa-* "formed" can convincingly be considered the source.

Not rarely an inherited term does not occur outside Indo-Iranian, its ultimate origin being obscure or disputed: *bhiṣáj-* "physician"; *bheṣajá-* "medicine": Av. *baēšaza-* "medicine"; *párśu-* "rib, curved knife": Av. *parϑsu-* "rib"; *mastíska-* "brain";[9] *kárṇa-* "ear";[10] *vṛkṣa-* "tree"; *tvakṣ-* "to display energy, create". Complications are not however absent: *lapati* "he chatters", while doubtless related to a widespread Iranian group (*rap-, lap-*), may also be connected with 'Schallwurzeln' (**lep-, *rep-*) in

[1] H. Lüders, in K.Z. 49, p. 245 f.; Debrunner, Nachträge, I, p. 37. See J. Bloch, in Donum natalicium Schrijnen, Nijmegen-Utrecht 1929, p. 369 f. on *múhur* "suddenly" and *prādúḥ* "forth".
[2] See Debrunner, Nachträge, I, p. 7; S. Insler, in K.Z. 82, p. 1 ff.
[3] See e.g. Kuiper, in Festschrift-Debrunner, Bern 1954, p. 248 ff. on *sthāṇú-* "branchless trunk or stem".
[4] See e.g. K. F. Johansson, in I.F. 8 (1898), p. 160 ff.; J. Charpentier, in M.O. 1 (1906), p. 17 ff.; 6, p. 47 ff.; 13, p. 1 ff. For very uncertain attempts to explain difficult Vedic words as belonging to a popular vocabulary surviving in modern Indian languages: V. S. Agrawala, in I.L. 21, p. 1 ff.
[5] With Wackernagel, Grammatik, I, p. 45; Uhlenbeck, Wörterbuch, p. 162. Compare e.g. also Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, s.v. *puṇya-*.
[6] P. Tedesco, in J.A.O.S. 67, p. 85 ff.
[7] Tedesco, in J.A.O.S. 65, p. 86.
[8] See e.g. Kuiper, in I.L. 1958 (R. L. Turner Jub. Vol.), p. 349 ff.
[9] For speculations concerning more remote cognates: J. Charpentier, in K.Z. 46, p. 35 ff.
[10] Burrow's Dravidian etymology (in B.S.O.A.S. 11, p. 335) is not convincing.

other languages. In the course of the XXth century our knowledge of Iranian has considerably progressed by the discovery of some Middle Iranian languages, the publication of new material[1] and the exploration of living idioms in the frontier regions (Afghanistan etc.). The language of the Veda being closely associated with the ancient Iranian idioms the discovery and study of hitherto unknown Iranian material contributed to the advancement of the study of Indo-Iranian relationship and—improbable etymologizing apart—of part of the Vedic vocabulary by setting the new Iranian data beside the large mass of documents of the Vedic tradition.[2] However, identifying a Vedic hapax of more or less uncertain meaning with a set of resemblant Iranian forms remains a risky enterprise.[3]

Nevertheless, Middle Iranian data have been adduced to decide vexed questions, for instance as to whether *anvartitá* in ṚV. 10, 109, 2 should derive from *ṛt-* or *vṛt-*; Middle Persian Turfan and Zoroastrian Pahlavi now appear to point to the former possibility, furnishing also evidence for the general sense "to press (upon)";[4] however, an examination of the texts shows that the root *ṛt-* is rather to be regarded as meaning "to contest, challenge" and as having developed in India. The disputed *garút-* "wing (of a bird)", sometimes regarded as a cognate, by way of metathesis (< *(p)tarug-)*, of Gr. πτέρυξ "wing", may contain a root *(z)gar-* which is represented in Pašto, Sogdian and Ossetic to express the idea of "quickness".[5] Iranists should however realize the full extent of the intricacies which on the Indian side are far from rare and negligible. Sometimes the relations between two Vedic words—e.g. *pṛṣṭí-* "rib" and *pṛṣṭhá-* "back"—turn out obscure in consequence of an etymological puzzle: the Avestan equivalent of *pṛṣṭí-* means "back". There are more curious semantic bifurcations awaiting a final solution: *barhís-* "bed of sacrificial grass" is as to its form identical with Av. *barδiš-* "cushion", but has its ritual sense in common with Av. *barδsman-*.[6]

In some cases the progress of research leads us to reconsider an 'Iranian

---

[1] This new knowledge is largely derived from many texts in the languages of the Śakas, the manuscripts from Turfan and Sogdiana, and the Parthian books from Chinese Turkestan.

[2] See also Bailey, in I.L. 16, p. 114.

[3] Compare Bailey, in Felicitation volume-S. K. Belvalkar, Benares 1957, p. 1 f. on *raphitá-* (ṚV. 10, 117, 2) translated by "miserable" and Iranian *raf-* "to attack" and the same, in Sino-Indian studies, 5 (1957), p. 9 f. (*rúp-*).

[4] H. W. Bailey, in A.B.O.R.I. 48-49 (1968), p. 71 ff. whose conclusions are combatted by I. Kühn, in M.S.S. 28, p. 89 ff.

[5] Bailey, in A.L.B. 31-32 (1967-68), p. 8 ff. For *ápsas-* (translated "projecting part of the body" and "injury") the same, in Studia-A. Pagliaro, I, Rome 1969, p. 137 ff.

[6] See also Thieme, in Z.D.M.G. 107, p. 72.

solution'. Ancient and modern exegetes were embarrassed by a few places in the Ṛgveda (1, 98, 2; 3, 49, 4; 7, 5, 2) where the meaning of the verbal adjective *pṛṣṭá-* deviates from the usual sense of the verb *pṛcchāti*, viz. "to ask". Although translations such as "desired" ("gesucht")[1] were proposed to save the unity of the word-base, a more satisfactory interpretation seemed to be "strengthened" which would point to an etymological connection with *pṛkṣa-*, if this adjective, now translated by "spotted", now by "swift", then again by "bringing food", may be rendered by "strong".[2] The etymological connection proposed, in reliance on this meaning, with Av. *frasa-* "strong, invigorated"[3] was however shown to meet with a difficulty on the Old Persian side,[4] and, if one would consider[5] the adjective *pṛkṣa-* etc. to constitute an enlargement with *-s-* of *pṛc-* "to fill, overwhelm with, shower upon, give lavishly" and to express the sense of "abundant, giving lavishly", a suitable internal interpretation may be provided.

From the middle of the period surveyed (1899) dates Uhlenbeck's Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch which, beside[6] J. Leumann's compilations of the vowels and the letters *a - ju*,[7] was long to remain the only repository of information on this province of Indian linguistics, useful to a point, but too concise, defective from the beginning[8] and after a few decades antiquated.

Things took a turn, with a prospect of greater success, when in the twenties the interest in the languages superseded by the Indo-Aryans increased and their relations with the present-day non-Aryan linguistic stock which must have been of the same kin came to be more systematically investigated.[9] It is true that there had been pioneers: as early as 1856 and 1875 Caldwell[10] argued already in favour of the possibility of the Dra-

---

[1] Grassmann, Wörterbuch; Geldner (but with an inconsistency which is not rare in his translations, 7, 5, 2 "erstärkt").

[2] Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, II, p. 328.

[3] Bailey, in T.P.S. 1953, p. 21 ff.; 1956, p. 102 f.

[4] J. Gershevitch, The Avestan hymn to Mithra, Cambridge 1959, p. 224 (cf. p. 233).

[5] With Renou, Études, p. 67 f.

[6] There was a brief synopsis radicum in Bopp's Glossarium sanscritum (1830) to supply some (partly incorrect) etymological information.

[7] J. Leumann, Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Sanskritsprache, I, Thesis Strassburg 1893; new and enlarged Leipzig 1907.

[8] Many I.E. etymologies entered were then already very dubious; the Old Iranian data were very incompletely utilized, the special literature not exhaustively exploited.

[9] C. Régamey, Bibliographie analytique des travaux relatifs aux éléments anaryens dans la civilisation et les langues de l'Inde, B.E.F.E.O. 34 (1935), p. 429 ff. (up to 1934); M. B. Emeneau, Linguistic prehistory of India, Proc. Am. Phil. Soc. 98 (1954), p. 282 ff.; Mayrhofer, Neue Literatur zu den Substraten im Altindischen, in Arch. Or. 17-18, p. 367 ff.

[10] R. Caldwell, A comparative grammar of the Dravidian or South-Indian family of languages, London 1856, ²1875, ²p. 56 ff. Wholly untenable views were pronounced by P. T. Srinivas Iyengar, in Anthropos, 9 (1914), p. 1 ff.

vidian origin of some elements of the Sanskrit vocabulary, incorrectly ascribing, however, other resemblances to the "original unity of Dravidian and Indo-European languages". It soon became clear[1] that we are confronted here with a very intricate and almost illimitable complex of problems, not only because of the fact that borrowings may in the course of time become unrecognizable but also because there has been an influx of Sanskrit words in the Dravidian languages which was likewise subjected to sweeping changes and processes of adaptation. Anyhow, insufficient knowledge of historical phonetics on the Dravidian side, incompleteness of the dictionaries available and inaccuracy or arbitrariness in semantic questions has often led to untenable assumptions.[2] The pioneers in this field were liable to overlook that the examination of one or two Dravidian languages does not suffice to identify a form hypothetically ascribed to prehistoric Dravidian or to an unknown proto-historic Dravidian tongue as the source of a Vedic word. Yet the Dravidian origin of several Vedic words has been convincingly established:[3] *vrīhí-* "rice";[4] *kuṇḍá-* "pitcher"; *kuṇḍalá-* "earring"; *ulūkhala-* "mortar".[5] Although part of the active period of borrowing from Dravidian seems to have coincided with the composition of many younger Vedic works, the number of Ṛgvedic words admittedly deriving from that source is rather small.[6] In any case the Dravidisms in the Veda attest the presence of Dravidians in many regions of North-India at that period. Among them are also crucial problems of previous Indo-European etymological research such as e.g. *anala-* "fire".[7]

For the time being we must however not rarely be content with the statement that a word cannot reasonably be considered Indo-European and may be Dravidian: *jáṭā-* "matted hair"; *palālí-* "stalk, straw"; that the assumption of a Prākritism is less improbable than that of a Dravidian origin: *paṭhati* "he recites"; or that the origin of a word is Dravidian (*nagara-* "town", in Drav. *nakar*, *nagaru*) rather than I.E. (*ger-* "come together": Gr. ἀγορά "assembly, market-place" etc.). Or the hypothesis of Dravidian origin, though more probable, does not remove all causes of objection: *kúla-* "race, family" (Dravidian rather than the traditional

---

[1] H. Gundert, Die dravidischen Elemente im Sanskrit, Z.D.M.G. 23 (1869), p. 517 ff.

[2] See also F. Kittel, in Festgruss-R. v. Roth, Stuttgart 1893, p. 131 ff.

[3] See also S. Konow, Linguistic survey of India, IV (1906), p. 277 ff.; Mayrhofer, in Arch. Or. 18 (1950), p. 367 ff.

[4] E. H. Tuttle, in J.A.O.S. 47 (1927), p. 263 ff.; otherwise J. Bloch, in Études asiatiques (Ecole fr. Extrême-Orient, Hanoi), 1925, I, p. 37 ff.

[5] For a far-fetched I.E. guess: Wüst, PHMA, 2, p. 47 ff.

[6] Not all cases mentioned by Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 386 are beyond dispute.

[7] F. O. Schrader, in K.Z. 56 (1929), p. 125 ff. (cf. Tamil *aṇal* "fire"), not < "insatiable" (cf. Gr. ἄναλτος "insatiate"), or deriving from *an-* "to breathe".

connection with Gr. τέλος in the sense of "troop, squadron").[1] The at first sight plausible explanation of *maṭacī-* "locust"[2] as representing the Dravidian *miḍicě* etc.[3] becomes questionable, or at least complicated by the occurrence of words of similar form in Iranian languages (e.g. Av. *maδaχā̆-*). Here other possibilities may occur to us: names of small animals of typical, individual character, belonging to 'primitive' spheres of life are often, irrespective of ethnic or cultural boundaries, similar and formed, reformed or adapted under the influence of popular and affective processes; names of migrating insects are moreover apt to become international or to join in a "Kulturwort-Wanderung unbestimmter Richtung".[4]

Sylvain Lévi[5] must be given credit for drawing attention to names of peoples and countries occurring in regions which in older times may have been inhabited by peoples of Austro-Asiatic tongue, which while often occurring in pairs *(Aṅga: Vaṅga; Pulinda: Kulinda)* do not admit of Aryan or Dravidian etymologies. Considered as Austric these words may be analyzed as containing identical bases combining with different prefixes; the double forms may be due to originally dialectic or ethnic differentiation. Attention was, likewise in and after the twenties, drawn also to some interesting plant names. An instructive instance is furnished by the word for the ficus glomerata and its fruit, *udumbára-*, which is common since the brāhmaṇas. I.E. explanations, though attempted,[6] are for reasons of botanical geography improbable, and a satisfactory Austro-Asiatic etymology[7] is possible: the fruits of this ficus being ovoid and very rich in seeds resembles the gourd (Skt. *tumba-*). Both words, as well as *goḍumba-* "water-melon", may therefore be expected to derive from the same source meaning either "ovoid, round" or "full of seeds". This source seems to survive in Austro-Asiatic words such as *ḍub, ḍumka, ḍimbu* expressing ideas such as "roundish, swollen, oval (of fruit), cucumis etc."[8] Other Vedic words which with reasonable plausibility may have been drawn from the Austric substratum are: *bálbaja-* "a species of coarse grass" (if to be connected with *bajá-* "a definite herb") and *kúbara-* "curved rail on a carriage". Even if no Austric parallel has been found, the very

---

[1] Burrow, in B.S.O.A.S. 11, p. 139.

[2] G. A. Jacob, in J.R.A.S. 1911, p. 510.

[3] K. B. Pathak, in I.A. 42 (1913), p. 235 and many others.

[4] Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, II, p. 554.

[5] S. Lévi, in J.A. 203 (1923), p. 1 ff. This article was, together with J. Bloch's article on Sanskrit and Dravidian, in M.S.L. 25, p. 1 ff., and contributions by J. Przyluski, translated into English by P. Ch. Bagchi, Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian in India, Calcutta 1929.

[6] Petersson, in I.F. 34, p. 229 f.

[7] After Przyluski's ingenious but methodically immature speculations (in J.A. 208 (1926, I), p. 1 ff.) Kuiper, Proto-Munda words, p. 23 ff.

[8] Kuiper, o.c., p. 24.

form, structure and meaning of a word may point to this—or in any case to a non-I.E.—origin: *(tumbara-, tumbaru-) tumburu-* "coriander"; *trapusa-* "gourd" (with *-us-*, not *-uṣ-*), and generally words containing the *l* which in the Ṛgveda is rare.

The well-known fact that borrowed words are not infrequently received in more than one form shows itself here also. Thus *śárvarī-* "(the star-spangled) night" belongs to a group of forms expressing the idea "spotted, variegated": *śabála-, kábara-, karbará-, karburá-* etc. The very variation and the impossibility of reducing these variants to one and the same original form by the assumption of dissimilation etc. point to foreign origin.[1] In many cases the types of this variation were moreover explained from a peculiarity of the languages which have been the source of the borrowings.[2] Since prefixation like initial nasalization of the word base is characteristic of the Austric languages, *kurangá-* "antelope" and *sāránga-* or *sāraṅgá-* "dappled, spotted" are regarded as ultimately related.[3] Incidentally such variation may however be due to the word's being under a religious or ill-omened tabu.[4]

As already observed words of unknown origin which play an important part in the history of Indian culture—intelligibly, but often fruitlessly—continue to fascinate those who have a bent for speculative thought. It is not clear why for instance an I.E. descent should "in principle be credible"[5] in a case such as *linga-* "mark, sign, characteristic, (the male) sexual organ" and "Śiva's emblem":[6] the etymologies proposed[7] are for phonetic or semantic reasons far from convincing, to say nothing of the far-fetched supposition that the word developed from *nyanga-* "mark; sign" (weak grade of the vowel and a prākritic *n > l*).[8] An attempt to explain it from an Austric source was believed to offend too much against semantics to carry conviction;[9] if however the meaning "sexual organ", which occurs later than "mark", might be assumed to have existed at an early date outside those texts which are known to us the association with *lángala-* "plough" etc. and hence the hypothesis of an Austric origin are in themselves semantically admissible, because the conception of the primitive

---

[1] Cf. also Kuiper, in A.O. 16, p. 306.
[2] Przyluski, in B.S.L. 30 (1930), p. 196 ff.
[3] Compare also the remarks made by Kuiper, in Festschrift-Debrunner, p. 241 ff. on *kaparda-* "braided and knotted (matted) hair".
[4] See e.g. Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, s.v. *maṇḍúkaḥ*.
[5] Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, III, p. 101.
[6] It should be noticed that some important 'meanings' are usually left out of account.
[7] e.g. by Fick, Wörterbuch, I⁴, p. 305; Uhlenbeck, Wörterbuch, p. 261: Gothic *leik*, Old Engl. *líc* "body" etc.
[8] Burrow, in Sarūpa-Bhāratī, L. Sarup Mem. Vol., Hoshiarpur 1954, p. 9 f.
[9] Cf. also Kuiper in A.O. 16, Leiden 1938, p. 307.

plough as a phallus is well known.[1] Then however the relation between the two above acceptations must be "sexual organ" > "characteristic mark" and the fact is overlooked that the second *l* in *lāṅgala-*, which probably is Austric, can no longer be regarded as a suffixal element.[2]

In other cases the I.E. origin of a word, though probable, confronts us with more or less serious difficulties which sometimes led to seeking the solution in other vocabularies: *pāṣāṇá-* "stone"; or the inducement to discover a non-I.E. origin may lie in a negative criterion: the striking rarity of the I.E. *b* has for instance been a reason for doubting the I.E. relation of *bála-* "force".[3]

In a considerable number of cases scholars whilst agreeing about the non-Indo-European character of a word[4] are at variance with regard to the question as to which substratum it should be ascribed: *puṇḍarīka-* "white lotus-flower" was because of its white colour associated with Austro-Asiatic, because of its growing in water with Dravidian words;[5] other instances are: *músala-* "pestle"; *mayúra-* "peacock". Many words or word-groups are so widespread in both language families that it is on the evidence now available practically impossible to decide where they originated. It is not surprising that semantic and etymological obscurity is comparatively frequent among those words which are only once or twice recorded: *phárvara-*;[6] *tardá-* "a kind of bird or insect"; *bekanāṭa-*;[7] *baṣkáya-* "one year old" (?).

There are instances where the analysis of a word as well as its origin may be explained both ways, that is to say, the word may be Indo-European, as well as adapted from the substratum, or where substratum etymologies seem to be as good as any solution hitherto proposed: *aṅkurá-* "sprout, shoot" may be identical with Gr. ἀγκύλος "curved" or belong to a Dravidian word family for "sprouting";[8] or with difficulties in both directions, *tumula-* "noisy". More frequent are however those cases in which neither origin has up to the present day been made plausible: *máṇḍala-* "circle, orb", or proved beyond doubt: *trapu-* "tin"; *palālí-* "stalk, straw". The

---

[1] A. Dieterich, Mutter Erde, Leipzig ³1925, p. 107 ff.; 147.

[2] Kuiper, in A.O., l.c.; the same, Proto-Munda words, p. 127 f.

[3] For *bali-* "offering, tribute" see K. Ammer, in W.Z.K.M. 51, p. 133 ff. and Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, II, p. 420.

[4] For a survey and discussion of supposedly foreign elements in the vocabulary of the Ṛgveda see F. B. J. Kuiper, Rigvedic loanwords, in Festschrift-W. Kirfel, Bonn 1955, p. 137 ff.

[5] Kuiper, Proto-Munda words, p. 91 f. (Austro-Asiatic; the same in Festschrift-Debrunner, p. 241); Burrow, in B.S.O.A.S. 12, p. 385 (Dravidian).

[6] "sowing field", Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 135, ??

[7] Wüst, in I.L. 1958, I, p. 325 ff.

[8] Burrow, in B.S.O.A.S. 12, p. 366.

Ṛgvedic noun *bundá-* "arrow" may be quoted to illustrate a frequent dilemma: I.E. origin is not demonstrable and improbable because a Sanskrit *b* can hardly be proved to continue an I.E. *b*; the assumption of a Prākritism[1] (*vṛddhá-* "cut off" > *bundá-* "the cut joint of a reed") is for phonetical and chronological reasons unacceptable; there are vague Austro-Asiatic possibilities. Many words were in the course of time without any finality even claimed for all three families, Indo-European, Dravidian and Austro-Asiatic: *pāṭala-* "pale red"; *piśāca-* name of a class of demons; *maṇḍúka-* "frog"; *mayū̆ra-* "peacock"; *kalaha-* "strife, quarrel";[2] *daṇḍa-* "stick, staff, club";[3] *kambalá-* "woollen blanket"; *gaṇa-* "troop"; *bīja-* "seed"; *phalgu-* "weak, small"; *ghoṭa-* "horse"; *phála-* "fruit" was already in 1875 incorporated in the Dravidian, in 1909 in the Indo-European, in 1948 in the Austro-Asiatic group.

Although it may, by way of recapitulation, be said that the influence of the 'pre-Aryan' languages (i.e. of the substratum) is—especially on the post-Vedic stages of Indo-Aryan—considerable and that in this particular field of etymological research a reliable method is not only developing but also proving fruitful, this foreign influence is for the time being in many matters of detail difficult to establish or to state precisely. Often a foreign looking word may, as already observed, have originated in both substrata, or it may have been Austric in origin and borrowed through Dravidian or vice versa, not to mention other possibilities. Research is much hampered by the very structure and real or supposed variability of Austric words and the deplorable state of our knowledge of many non-Aryan languages, especially of their history. Good grammars and dictionaries, reliable preparatory work such as proper comparative study of the languages of the substrata, the production of internal etymological evidence in the Austric languages etc. are acknowledged wants; the relation between the Indian Austric idioms and their cognates in Further India has not yet been worked out. Much that has been written in this connection, especially on loanwords from the Austro-Asiatic substratum, must therefore be regarded as tentative and even premature, the very method adopted being necessarily defective and provisional.[4] The very supposition that the present-day vocabulary of Austric languages—the development

---

[1] Tedesco, in Language, 22, p. 190.
[2] A certain reminiscence of Gr. κόλαφος "buffet" is (like *kapála-* "cup, jar": Gr. κεφαλή "head") a mere coincidence.
[3] For a complication on the Dravidian side: M. B. Emeneau, in I.L. 1958 (Turner Jub. Vol. I), p. 71 ff.
[4] See e.g. A. Master, in J.R.A.S. 1949, p. 199 f.; Emeneau, in J.A.O.S. 75, p. 145 ff.; S. S. Bhave, in P.A.I.O.C. 20 (1962), I, p. 25 ff.

of which is assumed to have been comparatively slow—may enable us to reconstruct prehistoric forms spoken about 3000 years ago and the impossibility of checking by means of historical data the many free variants of word forms taken for granted in proposing an etymology are likely to be sources of serious errors or uncertainty.

It is intelligible that in this situation desperate attempts are made to resuscitate traditional, but rejectable, I.E. etymologies or to catch[1] at the new straw of for instance root dissection, which is on the verge of arbitrariness: the identity of *daṇḍa- (< *dandra-?)* "stick, club", which is widespread in Munda and Dravidian, and Gr. δένδρον "tree" was defended again,[2] notwithstanding serious difficulties on both sides (δένδρον is a secondary form for *δένδρεϝον; incongruous forms in other Indian languages are left out of account, comparable forms are found in Dravidian); *lavaṇa-* "salt" was held to stand for *sl-avaná-* belonging to Lat. *sal,*[3] but what is the element *-avaṇa-?*[4] Sometimes however the return to Indo-European seems to hold out a prospect of success. Notwithstanding its I.E. suffix *-bha-* (occurring in nouns denoting animals) *gardabha-* "ass" was, after some unsuccessful I.E. explanations, given a far-fetched Dravidian origin;[5] however, the ancient Indians themselves appear to have found the right explanation ("the crying animal": *gard-* "to cry, shout" actually occurs; similarly, the synonymous *rāsabha*: *ras-* "to roar, yell").[6] There is a sufficiency of textual evidence to contest the assertion that *śava-* "dead body" is Dravidian;[7] the etymology already considered in the Pet. Dict. (*śū-* "to swell") is more probable.[8]

Rightly observing that the number of indubitably I.E. words in the Veda, in spite of the I.E. character of its basic vocabulary, is not impressively large, and that the tendency to adopt non-Aryan elements, even if they seem to be superfluous, was increasingly active, some scholars also recommended the study of the relations between the Vedic Indians and the languages of neighbouring countries in the North, North-East and West.[9] In spite of the possibility of contact with Tibeto-Burman idioms

---

[1] e.g. with Wüst, in Annales Acad. Scient. Fennicae, B, 93, 1 (1956), p. 1 ff.
[2] Bailey, in T.P.S. 1952, p. 57 ff.
[3] Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 151.
[4] For other 'reactionary' I.E. suppositions see Wüst, PHMA, e.g. 2, p. 32 in connection with the much discussed *śiṃśumāra-* "delphinus gangeticus". For a difference of opinion about *drumbhūlī-* "Indra's bow" see Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, s.v.
[5] e.g. Th. Bloch, in Wörter und Sachen, 2, p. 7 ff. (*garda-* = *jaḍa-* "cold" (!), because it is the animal of Śītalā, the goddess of small-pox, the adjective *śītala-* meaning "cool").
[6] H. Lüders, in A.O. 13 (Leiden 1934), p. 86 ff.
[7] Thus Burrow, Sanskrit language, p. 386.
[8] G. Roth, in K.Z. 78, p. 112 ff. Cf. also Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, III, p. 255, s.v. *vetasáḥ*.
[9] See A. C. Woolner, in Asutosh Memorial Volume, Patna 1926, p. 1 ff. It is needless to

no evidence of influence from this side has hitherto been produced. The possibility of direct or indirect borrowings from prehistoric peoples inhabiting other border regions or adjacent countries is of course not to be precluded. As long as however the script of the Indus civilization remains unintelligible,[1] the language it represents is unknown and any suggestion of an Indus borrowing[2] a mere guess, to which one might however feel inclined by the existence of similar word forms for the same concept in Sanskrit and other languages which are not derivable from one another.

The vexed problem presented by *átharvan-*, the name of the head and the members of a family of mythical priests, led some scholars because of the *th* as against the *t* in Av. *átar-* "fire" with which it was connected[3] to a loanword hypothesis (< Av. *áþravan-*). A more recent supposition is to regard the word as Indo-Iranian, preserving a base *ath-* identical with Av. *áθ-* "terrify" and other Iranian words, so as to mean "the apotropaeist par excellence", who possesses the **athar-* "power of apotrope" in his title, which then is formed like the archaic Vedic *maghá-van-*, Av. *maga-van-*; Vedic *r̥tắ-van-*, Av. *aša-van-*, Old Persian *(a)rtā-van-*.[4] Some words with internal *rs* instead of *r̥ṣ* may be of Iranian origin, e.g. *br̥sí-* "a cushion of twisted grass".

Etymological investigations are sometimes hampered by the occurrence or possibilities of irregular changes in the word form which tend to obscure its more original form. Whereas for instance the Pet. Dict., followed by Monier Williams, appears to have interpreted the word for "wheat" *godhū́ma-* literally as a compound "earth-smoke" (because of the smoke-like appearances of the pollen when raised by the wind)—others preferring "cow-smoke",[5]—later on the insight gained ground that this word cannot be disconnected from the synonymous Av. *gantuma-*, N. Pers. *gandum*, to which other Iranian words, e.g. KhS. *ganam* < **gandama-*[6] were added. The difference between the Indian form and the Iranian words with *gan-* has, with different degrees of improbability, been explained on the supposition of foreign (Finno-Ugrian,[7] Semitic) origin of the name for "wheat"

---

say that those languages which have been totally extinguished by the advance of Indo-Aryan may have been sources of borrowings which must remain unknown for ever.

[1] G. R. Hunter, The script of Harappa and Mohenjodaro, London 1934. For a new and noteworthy attempt: A. Parpola, S. Koskenniemi, S. Parpola and P. Aalto, Decipherment of the Proto-Dravidian inscriptions of the Indus civilization, Copenhagen 1969 (two pamphlets); very objectionable: D. Schrapel, Die Entzifferung des Yatischen, Marburg 1969.

[2] See e.g. Benveniste, in Donum natalicium Schrijnen, Nijmegen 1929, p. 371 ff.; worthless: P. Nāth, in I.H.Q. 7, suppl. p. 1 ff.; 8, suppl. p. 1 ff.

[3] J. von Fierlinger, in K.Z. 27, p. 334 ff.

[4] Bailey, in T.P.S. 1956, p. 90 and compare Benveniste, ibidem, 1945, p. 68 f.

[5] Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, II, 1, p. 268; cf. however ibidem, II, 2, p. 499.

[6] Bailey, in B.S.O.S. 8, p. 122.

[7] Przyluski, in R.O. 1928-30, p. 125 ff.

or of influence of a Dravidian *gōdi* etc. denoting the same cereal. But how are we to know exactly what form preceded *godhûma-*, which is not the only word for a species of cereal the root connection and phonetic development of which are in part or wholly obscure?

Attempts to establish a Semitic etymology were often badly devised and cannot as a rule be welcomed as a pis aller in cases such as *bali-* "offering, gift, tribute":[1] although the *b* and the absence of acceptable I.E. contacts on the one hand and the popular character of bali offerings on the other would point to an indigenous origin, a mere reference to corresponding terms in languages[2] of the South did not convince all etymologists that this must have been Dravidian. Or we remain uncertain as to whether a word went to the East or to the West: *nálada-* "Indian spikenard": Gr. νάρδος. The explanation of (AV. 1, 25, 2) *hrūḍu-*, the reading of which is uncertain, "the god of the yellow one" as a borrowing from the Proto-Semitic (*harūḍu* "gold")[3] was justly combatted and can by no means be adduced as an argument in favour of early Indo-Semitic relations.[4] Nor has the AV. *taimāta-*, which refers to a snake demon, anything to do with the Babylonian Great Mother *Ti'āmat*.[5] Mere nonsense may be ignored, e.g. the interpretation of ṚV. *vamrí-* "ant" as the name of Babylon;[6] of *pulasti-* "wearing the hair smooth" as "Philistine";[7] or of *apsaras-* as deriving from an Old Egyptian word *ab* "to dance" and Skt. *sarati* "she moves".[8] Whatever the origin of *mlecchá-* "foreigner, stammerer"—the variations in other I.A. languages (Pāli *milakkha-* etc.) point to a foreign source[9]—it has nothing to do with the Hebrew *melech* "king".[10]

In some cases etymological problems were complicated by the discovery of Aryan words in the Near East. What to say of *maṇi-* "necklace, pearl, gem", which after abortive attempts to pass for Indo-European (e.g. **mel-no-* "what is great", and hence "swollen": Gr. μάλα "very"!) was successively included among the supposedly Semitic[11] and Austro-Asiatic[12]

---

[1] J. Halévy, in M.S.L. 11, p. 81.
[2] Kuiper, in Festschrift-Kirfel, p. 183.
[3] V. Henry, in J.A. 9, 10 (1897), p. 511 ff.
[4] Henry, La magie dans l'Inde antique, Paris 1904, p. 184 f.
[5] Thus B. G. Tilak, in Essays-R. G. Bhandarkar, Poona 1917, p. 31 ff.
[6] A. C. Sen, in J.A.S.B. 5, 10 (1909), p. 407 ff.
[7] H. K. Deb, Ehrengabe-W. Geiger, Leipzig 1931, p. 183.
[8] R. G. Harshe, in A.L.B. 21, p. 263 ff.
[9] R. Schafer, Ethnography of ancient India, Wiesbaden 1954, p. 23 f. who under the impression that in the Mahābhārata it was mostly used for people living in close proximity to Tibeto-Burmese regions suspects that the word is taken from proto-Tibetan.
[10] As was supposed by K. P. Jayaswal, in Z.D.M.G. 68 (1914), p. 719. Improbable combinations also by B. Liebich, in B.S.O.S. 8, p. 625 and V. S. Agrawala, in I.H.Q. 27, p. 1 ff.
[11] Halévy, in M.S.L. 11, p. 81.
[12] Kuiper, in Festschrift-W. Kirfel, p. 153 f. who unconvincingly starts from a primary

contributions to the Sanskrit vocabulary, to be claimed again for Indo-European on the strength of an Asianic *mani-nnu* "composite neck-ornament",[1] which seems to agree with ṚV. *maṇi-grīva-* "jewel-necked", i.e. "wearing a necklace" and, perhaps also of the uncertain Av. *zar∂nu-maini-* "with a golden neck-ornament" and, further, "notwithstanding the irregular *n*", of Latin *monīle* "necklace" which however is nowadays not immediately associated with *maṇi-*?[2] From the methodical point of view one should not, in such cases, exclude the possibility of borrowing from a language with which the prehistoric Aryans had come into contact before they reached Iran and India. Words presenting similar subjects for discussion are e.g. *khaḍgá-* "rhinoceros"; *guṇa-* "thread".[3]

It is however labour lost to argue an Asianic[4] origin of words such as *ambā-* "mother"[5] which are apt to recur in many languages (Elementar-verwandtschaft).

Arguing the possibility of the existence of a pre-Indo-European Indo-Mediterranean substratum some scholars proposed to account for a more or less striking similarity in sound and meaning between Greek and Old Indian words—e.g. ἄκανθα "thorn" and *kaṇṭaka-* "thorn"[6]—by the hypothesis of borrowing on both sides from the same source. That this substratum may be near to the fascinating realm of fantasy appears e.g. from unverifiable speculations on the origin of *paraśú-* "hatched" and Gr. πέλεκυς "axe".[7]

In other cases almost all principal languages between Greece and Further India or between Mesopotamia and Assam were—prematurely as a rule—considered for contributing their mite to the elucidation of a Vedic word. Thus *naḍá-* "reed" (cf. also *nāḍí* "tube, pipe, flute" etc.), formerly improbably regarded as Indo-European (Indo-Iranian), was explained as a Dravidian, an Austro-Asiatic[8] and an Anatolian word surviving also in

---

meaning "globular", combining *maṇi-* "gem etc." with *maṇi-*, *maṇika-* "water-jar" and including it among the foreign words with *n*.

[1] H. Kronasser, in W.Z.K.M. 53, p. 184 f.; Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, II, p. 556 f.

[2] A. Walde-J. B. Hofmann, Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, II, Heidelberg [3]1954, p. 108.

[3] Cf. also Debrunner, Nachträge, I, p. 107. It is very hazardous to rely (e.g. with A. J. van Windekens, in Z.D.M.G. 107 (1957), p. 554 ff.) on the similarity of a sequence of sounds in an individual Sanskrit word and a suffix or common sound group in Asianic or Mediterranean languages whilst accounting for semantic differences by a reference to cultural dissimilarity.

[4] i.e. coming from Asia Minor.

[5] P. Kretschmer, in K.Z. 57 (1930), p. 251 ff.

[6] W. Belardi, in Atti (Rendiconti) della Accademia Naz. dei Lincei, 8, 10 (1955), p. 308 ff. In general: V. Pisani, L'unità culturale indo-mediterranea, in Scritti in onore di A. Trombetti, Milan 1936, p. 199 ff. (= V. Pisani, Lingue e culture, Brescia 1969, p. 53 ff.; hazardous).

[7] Wüst, in Festschrift-W. Kirfel, p. 363 ff.

[8] Kuiper, Proto-Munda words, p. 81 ff. whose method allows him to annex also *daṇḍa-*

Gr. νάρθηξ "giant fennel";[1] *kapí-* "monkey" (cf. Gr. κῆπος, κῆβος, Hebrew *qōph*); *nīla-* "of a dark colour" as Indo-European substratum, 'Indo-Mediterranean'.[2] Not always, however, I.E. descent can be shown to be less probable than a non-I.E. origin (e.g. *kūpa-*: "hole, cave"; Lat. *cūpa* "tub").

In the case of words for which no, or no disputable, I.E. etymology was ever proposed, other Eastern possibilities attracted attention. Thus *bāṇá-*, *bā́ṇa-* "reed-shaft, arrow" (cf. also *vāṇī́-* "reed") was regarded as a borrowing from Austric words for "bow" (cf. Mon *pan*; Malay *panah*) as well as "bamboo" (Sakai *awān* etc.);[3] although an Austric origin is in itself, in the case of terms for weapons, instruments etc., worth considering, neither attempt at an explanation is final.

On account of certain resemblances the origin of a word has sometimes been sought in Austro-Asiatic, but the supposedly original forms were only available from languages outside India: *alābu-* "bottle-gourd".[4] Occasional speculations concerning a prehistoric contact with, or influence exerted by, an 'Oceanic group of languages'[5] have so far led to no reliable result.

Many etymologies are retained for want of something better: does *ásura-* "opponent of the devas" which seems to have been an ancient Indo-Iranian term for "powerful lord or god" really belong to *asu-* "vital strength"?[6] Occasionally opinions remain divided because the form of the word and the nature of the concept denoted make it difficult to make a choice: should we connect *vájra-* "Indra's (thunder) weapon" with words for "breaking, splitting" or, in connection with its function and ancient explanations (*vajra-* i.e. "vigour"), with words for "vegetative power, vigour, vitality"? So it remains a fact that the origin of many important words is up to the present day wrapped in mystery notwithstanding the

---

"stick, staff" and other words to this group.

[1] W. Porzig, in Z.I.I. 5 (1927), p. 265 ff.

[2] See e.g. also Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, II, p. 174 and III, p. 115 f. s.v. *lopāśá-* "fox, jackal".

[3] Grassmann's suggestion (from *vraṇa-* "wound", Wörterbuch, 904) is only illustrative of the inconsiderateness of his generation in matters of phonetics and etymology; Przyluski, in B.S.L. 25, p. 66 ff.; the same, Pre-Aryan, p. 19 ff.; Kuiper, Proto-Munda words, p. 34 (rejecting the former suggestion for morphological reasons, but encountering semantic difficulties if the word group should be extended, although the family of *baṇḍá-* "maimed" (hence "stripped" of reed) does not seem to have anything to do with *bāṇa-*.

[4] Przyluski, in J.A. 1926, p. 31 ff.

[5] See e.g. P. Rivet, in M.S.L. 27 (1926), p. 149.

[6] H. Güntert, Der arische Weltkönig, Halle S. 1923, p. 97 ff.; J. Gonda, Die Religionen Indiens, I, Stuttgart 1960, p. 75. The unfortunate resemblance to the Accadian *Aššur* has given rise to a series of highly speculative and from the point of view of the history of ideas improbable and superfluous conjectures; A. Banerji Sastri, in his very uncritical publication Asura-Indra, Patna 1926, even went so far as to identify both words.

sometimes ingenious, sometimes worthless suggestions to trace their history. Among these are e.g. *niṣká-* "a golden ornament for the neck or breast";[1] *raśanā-* "rope, bridle, girth"; *nīví-* "a kind of skirt"; *loṣṭá-* "lump of earth or clay"; *píṇḍa-* "ball, globe, clod"; *dṛṣát-* "rock"; *várpas-* "(pretended) form, artifice"; *karambhá-* "a kind of gruel"; *vána-* "forest" (Av. *vanā-* "tree"); *pítudāru-* "a species of tree" and similar tree names; *aśvatthá-* "ficus religiosa"; *pátāla-* "the lower regions of the universe"; *puruṣa-* "man"; *kīnára-* "cultivator of the soil"; *dīkṣate* "he consecrates himself"; *balákṣa-* "white"; *paṅgu-* "lame"; *paṇḍitá-* "learned"; *dīná-* "weak, sad, miserable"; *mákara-* "crocodile". Opinions remain divided on semantic and etymological puzzles such as *dhénā-* which is often translatable by "prayer",[2] or *phaligá-* which, though usually translated by "container etc.", was tentatively derived from a Dravidian word for "crystal".[3] Witty thoughts and ingenious combinations may, if they allow of verification[4] and foundation on fact, lead to a solution,[5] if not,[6] lead us astray or provoke amusement.

On the other hand, etymological polemics, even if the champion of a new explanation fails to prove its greater probability, may often show the weakness of more or less generally adopted equations, revive interest in forgotten questions or bring other problems nearer to a solution.[7] A recent discussion of the origin of the word *sarít-* "stream" entailed not only a reopening of the debate on the analysis of other words in *-it-*,[8] but

---

[1] For an unsuccessful I.E. etymology: Johansson, in I.F. 19 (1906), p. 122.

[2] S. G. Oliphant's (J.A.O.S. 32 (1912), p. 393 ff.) hazardous and often ignored or rejected identification with Lit. *dainà* "folk-song expressing *inter alia* religious sentiments" was recently defended by S. K. Chatterji, Balts and Aryans, Simla 1968, p. 66 ff.

[3] A. Master, in B.S.O.A.S. 11, p. 297 ff.

[4] For instance Thieme's explanation of *nodhás* (ṚV. 1, 124, 4) as **nas-dhá-* "sucking with the nose", i.e. "elephant".

[5] Thus *sphyá-* (in Vedic ritual) "a wooden sacrificial implement" may (originally as made of aspen wood) belong to the English tree name *asp(en)* : Thieme and K. L. Janert, in K.Z. 79, p. 110.

[6] I for one have grave doubts about the correctness of the derivation of *guṇa-* "thread" (as an adjective meaning "bovine" and then as a substantive "cow's tendon") from **gu-* "cow" (C. C. Rice, in Language, 6, p. 36 ff.); of *védi-* "sacrificial bed" from **(a)va-zd-i-* "seat" (*zd-* : *sad-* "to sit", after others K. L. Janert, in K.Z. 79, p. 76); or about the explication: *páṇḍu-* "pale" originally "frog-coloured" (*maṇḍúka-* "frog": P. Thieme, in Z.D.M.G. 93, p. 135 f.). The assumption of a root (e.g. **sphyā-* "to swell", Thieme, Heimat der idg. Gemeinsprache, Wiesbaden 1954, p. 16) is not always based on solid ground. Combinations such as *lākṣā́* "lac", *lakṣá-* "stake" and *lakṣa-* "a hundred thousand", all deriving from a lost word for "salmon" (German *Lachs*) and originally meaning "salmon-coloured", "share in salmon-fishing", "s shoal of salmon" (Thieme, ibidem, p. 20 ff.; 41 ff.; cf. K.Z. 69, p. 209) are too far-fetched to inspire confidence. (Cf. also H. Kronasser, in Archaeologica Austriaca, 18, p. 100 ff.; Mayrhofer, in Z.D.M.G. 105, p. 175 f.).

[7] A good example is Thieme's article Idg. **sal-*, 'Salz' im Sanskrit?, in Z.D.M.G. 111 (1961), p. 94 in which he tries to refute his opponent A. Nehring, in Festschrift-F. R. Schroeder, Heidelberg 1959, p. 123 ff.

[8] Wackernagel-Debrunner, Grammatik, II, 2, p. 321 f.

also a reconsideration of the 'original' or exact meaning of *salilá-* "water (in the Veda, of the sea)", which might be cognate, of the root *sṛ-* and of the word *sarít-* itself. Not rarely indeed our dictionaries have on the strength, or for the sake, of a supposed etymological relation consciously or unconsciously converged the meanings of words to a certain extent: *sarít-* was for instance believed to mean also "rill, brook" and the root *sṛ-* "to run", with which it is traditionally connected, "to flow".[1] Often also minor semantic differences between so-called synonyms—which as a matter of fact are rare—are blurred out and left by their compilers to their successors to be investigated into.

After two too ambitious and unsuccessful attempts by E. la Terza[2] and W. Wüst[3] M. Mayrhofer embarked upon a new undertaking: his Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen (since 1953), though betraying, in the first half of volume one, among other imperfections, many traces of precipitance and superficiality, deserves praise because of its many bibliographical notes, the suppression of references to other I.E. languages which can easily be found in other etymological dictionaries and a lavish supply of Austric and Dravidian explanations, however much these "sont venues encore obscurcir plutôt qu' éclairer une sémantique déjà difficile à fixer".[4]

The difficulties with which we are confronted in studying names of persons—part of which were included in Mayrhofer's dictionary—are in many cases considerable. Besides theophoric names (in a very large sense of the term), and proper names containing hoministic or cultural elements, or deriving from words for animals, plants etc. etc. which not rarely are etymologically clear, many names are still awaiting classification and explanation.[5]

---

[1] The Indian authorities limited themselves to *sṛ- gatau* "the root *sṛ-* is used in the sense of a movement".

[2] E. la Terza, Saggio di un lessico etimologico dell' antico indiano, in Rivista indo-graeco-italica, 8-13, Naples 1924-29.

[3] W. Wüst, Vergleichendes und etymologisches Wörterbuch des Alt-Indoarischen (Altindischen), Lieferung 1-3 (not continued), Heidelberg 1935 containing an unnecessarily verbose, conceited and unduly polemic introduction, a bibliography, a monography on the hapax *cākṣmá-* explained as "zum Himmels-Auge in Beziehung stehend" (I would prefer "characterized by vision") and 12 pages on the letter *a*.

[4] Renou, in Kratylos, 4 (1959), p. 42. It should be emphasized that all etymological dictionaries, however useful they may be for their bibliographical references and the sound judgement of their compilers, are collections of hypotheses—which as such are open to revision—rather than codifications of definitely established facts.

[5] J. A. van Velze, Names of persons in early Sanscrit literature, Thesis Utrecht 1938. Many proper names are discussed in Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch; compare also K. Hoffmann, in Wörter und Sachen, 21, p. 139 ff. Charpentier, in M.O. 28, p. 66 ff. was right in refusing assent to some guesses in connection with an Iranian origin of a few Vedic names. P. Horsch, in Asiatische Studien, 18-19 (1965), p. 227 ff., convincingly ascribed the spread of proper

Etymologizing names of Vedic gods means, generally speaking, skating over very thin ice. Here also the unquestionable identifications have been recognized long ago: *Agni* "Fire" (Lat. *ignis* etc.), *Uṣas* "Dawn" (Gr. ἠώς etc.), but the explanation of *Nāsatya* (another name of the Aśvins) from an Austric word for "horse" and a prefix *nā*[1] is as fantastic as the time-honoured Indo-European identifications of the type *Gandharva* = Κέν-ταυρος.[2] The unsolved problem of the origin of the name *Viṣṇu* has for instance been a matter of considerable speculation,[3] I.E. hypotheses being, e.g., the prefix *vi-* and the nominal element *snu-* (cf. *sắnu-* "surface, top") "lord of the wide summits or table-land" or "crossing the back (of the world)", or "spreading the plain(s)"; *vi-* "bird" and the suffix *snu-* (relying on the rejectable idea that the god originally was the sun-bird); *vi-* and the root **sen-* (Greek ἀνύω "to accomplish, effect, reach, win, obtain") "who by traversing, pervading etc. *(vi-)* wins or secures power or influence (for good)" (in harmony with a well-known side of the god's character, emphasized by the indigenous tradition), but the compound *vi-ṣan-* does not occur and the verb *san-* does not in the older texts combine with the proper name;[4] a Dravidian etymology defended before the Austric influence was a serious point in the discussion: "the god of the sky" *(viṇ)*;[5] there is a very hazardous Austric explication based upon the unprovable and unmethodical assumption that the god must be 'pre-Aryan' because he has no counterpart in I.E. mythology: *viṣ-* ⟨ *viṭh-*, *vĕṭh-* also occurring in geographical names.[6] What has been said in explanation of definite epithets, e.g. *Śipiviṣṭá*, is hardly more than guess-work.[7]

An instructive example is the name *Varuṇa*. Those[8] who, by means of etymologies, try, though overlooking phonetic and semantic difficulties[9], to discover or reconstruct Indo-European mythological, cosmic or socio-

---

names of the type *Gautamīputra* at the end of the Vedic period to the desire to make it clear that one is, also of one's mother's side, of brahminical descent.

[1] Przyluski, in I.H.Q. 9 (1933), p. 88 ff.

[2] A. Kuhn, in K.Z. 1, p. 513 ff.; defended by G. Dumézil, Le problème des Centaures, Paris 1929, p. 253 ff.

[3] Gonda, Aspects of early Viṣṇuism, p. 4; 54 f.

[4] A completely improbable etymology was proposed by V. Machek, in Arch. Or. 28 (1968), p. 107: *viṣṇu-* as an alteration of *viṣuṇa-* "various, changing".

[5] P. T. Srinivas Iyengar, Life in ancient India in the age of the mantras, Madras 1912; for the erroneous ideas of this author who disbelieves the theory of the Indo-Aryan immigration see also Anthropos, 9 (1914), p. 1 ff.

[6] Przyluski, in Arch. Or. 4 (1932), p. 261 ff.

[7] Gonda, Aspects of early Viṣṇuism, p. 106; add B. Schlerath, in Oriens, 8, p. 321; S. A. Dange, in Journal Ganganatha Jha Res. Inst. 25 (1969), p. 501.

[8] e.g. G. Dumézil, Ouranós-Váruṇa, Paris 1934.

[9] and unaware of the dangers inherent in designing a picture of the nature of a prehistoric idea on the basis of an (uncertain) etymological explication.

logical systems, were, during the last century, biassed in favour of the no
doubt incorrect but often maintained identification with Greek οὐρανός
"sky, heaven" which was assumed already before the classical period of
Indo-European linguistics. Others, whether they rejected this equation or
not, made, whilst emphasizing[1] some aspect of the god's nature or other,
their selection from some possibilities of connection between this name
and word families such as[2] *u̯el- "sight, vigilance" (in Latin *vultus* "vis-
age"), that of *vṛṇóti* "to cover, close round", that of *u̯er-* "to speak",[3]
Varuṇa representing the idea of "true speech", or that of *varatrá-* "strap,
throng" (and hence *Varuṇa* "the one who binds or fetters"—which is
perhaps least objectionable). Others again exposed themselves to justifi-
able criticism because of an ill-founded loanword hypothesis (from Hitt.
aruna- "sea"),[4] the conception of this god being borrowed from peoples in
the Near East, or fantasies about an Austro-Asiatic origin (an element
bharu or *maru*, recurring also in Sumerian).[5] No assistance can be ex-
pected from an appellative use of the name; attempts in this direction
came to nought. Before unanimity is reached as to the god's nature the
largely premature etymological discussion will not end.

The name of *Lakṣmī*, the goddess of prosperity, is doubtless identical
with the homonymous appellative "mark, sign, token" which, like *lakṣ-
man-* "(good or lucky, or also bad) mark, sign, characteristic", derives
from *lakṣ-* "to observe, recognize, know by means of indicating character-
istics": a *lakṣmī-* may be considered an object or "a being the very exist-
ence or presence of which means something".[6] The origin of the base
lakṣ- is however in dispute.

Space forbids to dwell upon other names, e.g. *Indra* (variously explain-
ed as I.E. or as a loanword from Hittite);[7] *Kubera* (Austric and related to
kubjá- "hunch-backed" etc. rather than I.E.: Gr. Κάβειρος as was often
believed); *Rudra* (some scholars followed the Indian tradition: *rud-* "to
weep", others "the red one" or "the heavenly one", least improbable "the

---

[1] like the indigenous tradition which in this case attaches much value to the god's noose
or fetters.

[2] For a survey see, in addition to Mayrhofer, Wörterbuch, III, p. 151 ff., S. Rodhe,
Deliver us from evil, Lund 1946, p. 59 f. An identification with a Slavonic divine figure
Veles" and the Lithuanian Vēlinas was recently defended by R. Jakobson, in Studi
linguistici-V. Pisani, Brescia 1969, p. 579 ff.

[3] Thieme, Mitra and Aryaman, New Haven 1957, p. 60 f.

[4] P. Kretschmer, in W.Z.K.M. 33, p. 1 ff. The occurrence of the form Aruna beside
Uruvana in the Near East does not prove the secondary character of the form Varuṇa. Cf.
also Mayrhofer, in Die Sprache, 5, p. 90 ff.

[5] Przyluski, in J.R.A.S. 1931, p. 613 ff.

[6] Gonda, Aspects of early Viṣṇuism, p. 215.

[7] Cf. also Debrunner, Nachträge, p. 12.

savage one": Lat. *rudis* "rude, uncultivated");[1] *Śiva* (Asianic,[2] Dravidian);[3] *Agastya* (at least two Dravidian explanations);[4] *Gandharva* (notwithstanding much diversity of suggestions only the identity with Av. *gandar∂wō* is certain). Here also the former preference for I.E. (especially Greek) associations, defended by the assumption of irregular sound correspondences has been largely transferred to internal (i.e. substratum) explanations.[5] In spite of detailed monographs[6] and numerous articles there remain many unsolved riddles or disputed problems.

Although names of rivers and mountains were often sanskritized, a thorough examination of their forms may, in many cases, make an Austrian or Dravidian origin plausible and furnish us with some information on the migrations of the ancient Indian peoples.[7]

---

[1] W. Wüst, Rudra, München 1955. Polemics continue: see e.g. R. N. Dandekar, in Journal Univ. Poona, 1 (1953), p. 94 ff.; Mayrhofer, in Z.D.M.G. 102, p. 62 ff.; V. Pisani, in Z.D.M.G. 104, p. 136 ff. (= V. Pisani, Lingue e culture, Brescia 1969, p. 317 ff.).

[2] W. Porzig, in Z.I.I. 5, p. 265 ff.

[3] S. Konow, in Linguistic survey of India, IV, 279.

[4] Burrow, in B.S.O.A.S. 12, p. 365; Kuiper, in Festschrift-Kirfel, p. 185.

[5] This is not to refute the original identity of some important socio-religious terms in Sanskrit (and Old Iranian) on the one and Latin on the other hand: cf. J. Vendryes, in M.S.L. 20 (1918), p. 265 ff.

[6] Thus the results reached by K. F. Johansson, Über die altindische Göttin Dhiṣaṇā, Uppsala 1917 (cf. Renou, Dhiṣaṇā in the Ṛgveda, in Oriental Thought (Nasik), 2, p. 17 ff.) and H. P. Schmidt's (Bṛhaspati und Indra, Wiesbaden 1968, p. 20 f.) explanation of the name *Bṛhaspati* as "Herr der Preisung" failed to have the general approval of the authors' colleagues.

[7] H. J. Pinnow, Die altindischen Bergnamen, (unpublished) thesis Freie Univ. Berlin 1952; the same, Zu den altindischen Gewässernamen, in Beiträge zur Namenforschung, 3, p. 217 ff.; 5, p. 1 ff.

INDEX

TERMINOLOGY, ETC.

INDIAN WORDS AND GRAMMATICAL ELEMENTS

E. J. BRILL-VERLAG   —   LEIDEN/KÖLN

Ebenfalls in der Zweiten Abteilung ist erschienen:

ERGÄNZUNGSBAND I

HINDIROMANE
IN DER ERSTEN HÄLFTE
DES
ZWANZIGSTEN JAHRHUNDERTS

VON

P. GAEFFKE

1966. XII, 155 Seiten   Gld. 37.—
   für Subskribenten der Zweiten Abteilung des Handbuches Gld. 33.—

Die moderne indische Romanliteratur aller Sprachen und Gattungen erweist sich immer deutlicher als eine wichtige Quelle, um die Kräfte kennenzulernen, die das moderne indische Leben bewegen. Darum erscheint dem Verfasser ein geisteswissenschaftliches Interesse zur Zeit am besten legitimiert zu sein, den Zugang zu dieser Literatur, – und das will hier sagen: zu der besonderen Ausprägung menschlichen Geisteslebens, das sie repräsentiert – zu eröffnen.

Indien, wie es ist, in den indischen Roman suchen zu wollen, würde aber der Literatur Gewalt antun. Für uns eröffnet sich hier vielmehr ein Indien, wie es dem Inder erscheint, und das ist ebenso erforschenswert.

Das Buch ist also keine Literaturgeschichte im positivistischen Sinne. Statt Titelsammlungen und Biographien hat der Verfasser sechs bedeutsame Romane ausführlich analysiert und so die Hauptfragen der Romanliteratur dargelegt. Etwa 50 Werke sind in den Anmerkungen verarbeitet, die dem Text nachfolgen. Die reichlichen Zitate (sämtlich unübersetzen Originaltexten entnommen) erscheinen in Übersetzung; der Wortlaut in Hindi (in Transkription) steht am Fuss der jeweiligen Seite.

E. J. BRILL-VERLAG   —   LEIDEN/KÖLN

Ebenfalls in der Zweiten Abteilung ist erschienen:

ERGÄNZUNGSBAND II

GRUNDBEGRIFFE
MODERNER INDISCHER ERZÄHLKUNST

AUFGEZEIGT AM WERKE JAYAŚAṄKARA PRASĀDAS
(1889-1937)

VON

P. GAEFFKE

In Indien entstanden die Erzählformen des Romans und der modernen kurzen Prosa erst nach der Rezeption des Englischen und angeregt durch das Vorbild der westlichen Literaturen. Wollte man daraus ableiten, dass die moderne indische Erzählliteratur 'invariants du genre romanesque' übernommen und mit lokalen historisch-soziologischen Elementen umkleidet habe, so würde man ihre Strukturen nicht erkennen und ihre Intentionen nicht sachgerecht beurteilen können. P. Gaeffke untersucht daher zunächst an der Prosa des bekannten Schriftstellers und Dichters Jayaśaṅkara Prasāda, wie die indische Sprache (hier das Hindi) durch Wortschatz, Satzformen und verbale Ausdrucksmöglichkeiten bereits innerhalb der Grundelemente erzählerischer Darstellung strukturbildende Konstanten formt. Aber auch die Typen des Erzählens sind in Phasierung, Vorgangsstruktur, Zeitauffassung und Erzählertypus durch das Hindutum Prasādas dermassen determiniert, dass man berechtigt ist, von typisch hinduistischen Erzählformen zu sprechen. Gerade die Wanderer/Wandlungs-Strukturen der Kurzerzählungen der Frühzeit, die Paradoxe der Jahre um 1925 und die Konstruktion der Erzählerperspektive in der Sammlung *Āndhī* (1933) spiegeln hinduistische Lebenshaltungen wieder, und dort, wo indische Symbole und indische Charaktertypen die Erzählungen beherrschen, ist der Zusammenhang zwischen Erzählstruktur und Hindutum noch greifbarer. Darüberhinaus beschäftigt sich der Verfasser mit indischen Formen der Anekdote, der Idylle und der Rangstreiterzählung und diskutiert die Fokus-artige Gestaltung als typologisches Kennzeichen von Kurzerzählungen. Verschiedene Hauptbegfiffe wie strukturenbildende Motive, Phasierung und Kurzform sind in ihrer historischen Entwicklung innerhalb der Hindi- und Bengali-Literatur dargestellt, so dass der repräsentative Wert der durch die Analyse der Prosa eines Autoren gewonnenen Ergebnisse für die moderne indische Erzählliteratur deutlich wird.

Ein ausführliches Register der Grundbegriffe des Erzählens und der Erzählmotive erschliesst das Buch auch für den allgemeinen und vergleichenden Literaturwissenschaftler, Soziologen und Religionswissenschaftler.